

103

# HEARINGS ON H.R. 6: THE ROLE OF ESEA PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL REFORM

---

Y 4. ED 8/1:103-4

Hearings on H.R. 6: The Role of ESE...

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 2, AND FEBRUARY 4,  
1993

**Serial No. 103-4**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1993

68-949 +.

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office  
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402

ISBN 0-16-041037-1



103

# HEARINGS ON H.R. 6: THE ROLE OF ESEA PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL REFORM

---

Y 4. ED 8/1:103-4

Hearings on H.R. 6: The Role of ESE...

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 2, AND FEBRUARY 4,  
1993

---

**Serial No. 103-4**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1993

68-949 -2

---

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office  
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402  
ISBN 0-16-041037-1

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri	WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
GEORGE MILLER, California	THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania	MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan	STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana	RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California	HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York	PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio	CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington	BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey	RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
JACK REED, Rhode Island	PETER HOECKSTRA, Michigan
TIM ROEMER, Indiana	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York	DAN MILLER, Florida
XAVIER BECERRA, California	
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia	
GENE GREEN, Texas	
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California	
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Puerto Rico	
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania	
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona	
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio	
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands	
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa	
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky	

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*  
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California	WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio	STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington	THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
JACK REED, Rhode Island	SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
TIM ROEMER, Indiana	RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	DAN MILLER, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York	MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
XAVIER BECERRA, California	JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
GENE GREEN, Texas	
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California	
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona	
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio	
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Puerto Rico	

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, DC:	
February 2, 1993.....	1
February 4, 1993.....	69
Statement of:	
Boysen, Commissioner Thomas C., Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, KY; William S. Woodside, Chairman, Sky Chefs, Inc., New York, NY; Michael Kirst, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Stanford Uni- versity School of Education, Stanford, CA .....	6
Carroll, Hon. Donald M. Jr., Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Edu- cation, Harrisburg, PA .....	71
Ernst, Don, Director of Education Policy, Office of Governor Bayh, Indi- anapolis, IN .....	97
Fuhrman, Susan, Director, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.....	88
Renier, James J., Chairman and CEO, Honeywell, Inc., Minneapolis, MN..	82
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Boysen, Commissioner Thomas C., Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, KY, prepared statement of .....	10
Carroll, Hon. Donald M. Jr., Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Edu- cation, Harrisburg, PA, prepared statement of .....	75
Ernst, Don, Director of Education Policy, Office of Governor Bayh, Indi- anapolis, IN, prepared statement of .....	102
Fuhrman, Susan, Director, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, prepared statement of .....	92
Kirst, Michael, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Stanford University School of Education, Stanford, CA, prepared statement of .....	32
Renier, James J., Chairman and CEO, Honeywell Inc., Minneapolis, MN, prepared statement of .....	86
Roemer, Hon. Tim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indi- ana, prepared statement of .....	4
Woodside, William S., Chairman, Sky Chefs, Inc., New York, NY, pre- pared statement of .....	24



## HEARING ON H.R. 6: THE ROLE OF ESEA PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL REFORM

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,  
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale E. Kildee, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Owens, Sawyer, Payne, Reed, Roemer, Becerra, Green, Woolsey, Romero-Barcelo, Strickland, Goodling, Gunderson, Boehner, Cunningham, and McKeon.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Jane Baird, education counsel; Lynn Selmsier, professional staff member; Jack Jennings, education counsel; Diane Stark, legislative specialist; Jeff McFarland, subcommittee counsel; and Margaret Kajeckas, legislative associate.

Chairman KILDEE. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education convenes this morning for its first hearing on H.R. 6, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1993. I have looked forward to this day a long time myself. I have been in the Congress now, this is my 17th year, and this is the first opportunity to preside over the subcommittee as we write this reauthorization.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes most of the Federal programs for elementary and secondary education. Appropriations for ESEA and related programs total nearly \$10 billion, or about one-third of the total appropriation for the Department of Education for fiscal 1993. This reauthorization promises to be one of the most exciting since the Act's original enactment in 1965. We have an administration and a Congress strongly committed to education, and that is on both sides of the aisle—I think all of you out there know that particularly in this committee we have great friends of education on both sides of the aisle. It is certainly a bipartisan concern. We are committed to education, and this gives us a special opportunity to re-examine these programs and work together to ensure their effectiveness.

In the last few weeks, I have been in contact with Secretary Riley. There has been close dialogue between the Department of Education and the White House. As a matter of fact, again, in my

over 16 years here in the Congress under both Democratic and Republican administrations, I have not seen such close dialogue and cooperation, a real openness where they are willing to listen to us and we listen to them, and I think this will be extremely important. And I know they want to share that dialogue, again, on both sides of the aisle.

Additionally, many groups and organizations both within and outside government have been carefully reviewing the ESEA and a number of recommendations have been put forth for strengthening these important programs. We did almost an APB last fall, asking people involved in education in various forms to really look upon ESEA as a kind of tabula rasa and write what they think would be the best education bill. Nineteen sixty-five was one of the greatest years for education that this country has ever known. Probably the greatest thing since the Morrill Act back in the time of President Lincoln.

And, as great as 1965 was, none of us want to be locked in a time warp. We have to look at the needs of education in 1993, take the best of that and add even more things and better things to meet the constantly changing needs of a dynamic education system and a dynamic society.

As we consider changes to Federal education programs, we must constantly keep in mind the importance of developing a system that responds to the total child. We must remember that children come to school with multiple needs. I taught school for 10 years. I repeatedly use this expression, but I will put it in the record again. I tell people in real life that I was a schoolteacher. I have taken this long, now 28 years, sabbatical in government. And some of those needs that those children bring to school are educational needs in the traditional sense and others may be health related, as a result of societal problems such as crime, drugs, homelessness, and the changed nature of many families. And while these latter needs are not, perhaps, directly educational, they clearly must be addressed so that children are able to learn.

We must also look at how ESEA and its related programs can contribute to sustained coordinated reform throughout our educational system. Today's hearings will begin our discussions by focusing on three questions: What is happening in school reform nationally? We know there are many good things taking place in education today. Let's look at some of those things that are taking place in reform. And what is the role of the Federal education programs in existing reform efforts, and how should Federal programs be revised to support school reform?

Our witnesses this morning bring a great deal of expertise and personal experience to the issues of school reform. They are Commissioner Thomas C. Boysen, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky; William Woodside, Chairman, Sky Chefs, Inc., New York, New York, and Dr. Michael Kirst, Professor of Education, Stanford University School of Education, Stanford, California.

Before we begin I would like to yield to my good friend Bill Goodling for any comments he may have. Mr. Goodling is the ranking Republican member of both this subcommittee and of the full Com-



mittee on Education and Labor. Besides being a very good friend of mine, he is a tremendous friend of education.

Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. I thank you for those kind words, Mr. Chairman. I won't try to determine where the real world is. I have been both places too, and I am not quite sure.

All I would like to add to everything you have said is that I would hope that we would continue something I think we have been trying to do the last few reauthorizations of elementary and secondary programs, and that is to emphasize quality and excellence, rather than just continue the business of accessibility. As I always said, what good does it do to have accessibility to something if it isn't excellence that you have accessibility to. I realize there was a purpose for that and a need for that, but now we are at the point where everything should be geared toward excellence in education, and I would hope that during reauthorization, any changes we can make will guarantee that, if we are going to be competitive in this very competitive world in which we are. The past is the past, and we don't want to dwell on it because it won't get us where we have to go in the future. So I would hope that everything we are looking at will focus on how do we do better.

They get upset with me when I say, don't say Chapter 1 is motherhood, ice cream and all those kinds of things. Don't say Head Start is ice cream, motherhood and all those things. It has to be better. It just has to be better than what it is. And I would hope that we can facilitate that getting better through some efforts on our part from the Federal level. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Goodling.

We will take some brief opening statements from the other members, and they may make a full statement for the record.

Mr. Roemer?

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just join in congratulating you and Mr. Goodling. I very much look forward in my second term in Congress to working with you again, both the ranking member and the Chairman. We worked together last year on the Higher Education Act, and I think we came up with a good piece of legislation. And I look forward to and I am very excited about working with both of you in this term of Congress.

As I was reading Tom Boysen's testimony last night and got to the part where he talked about going to Africa and how excited he was to teach in Kenya and Uganda for a couple of years in the 1960s, I was reminded of a book that I recently read by Pat Conroy called *The Water Is Wide*. It is about his experience teaching at Yamacraw Island off the coast of South Carolina in 1969, and teaching African American children that had been given up on. Now, today, in 1993 in our inner cities, the water is very wide as well. Our society has given up on some generations of these children.

In my district in Indiana, as opposed to my visit to Chicago schools 2 weeks ago, we share some of the same problems. There are many different problems in elementary and secondary education. I think we face today three fundamental questions from our panelists, which I hope they address. One, the States as laborato-

ries. What can our States tell us about experimentation, in turning education upside down and right-side up.

Secondly, what bold ideas are out there? I know Kentucky and California have tried some things. How much bolder can we get, because the problems are so deep? And thirdly, what is the Federal Government's role both in providing money and providing initiative and working with our businesses and working with our States and localities?

I am hoping that some of these questions can be answered today. I am very excited about the future of education, if we can come up with a cooperative role between the government and our States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement entered in the record.

Chairman KILDEE. Without objection.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Tim Roemer follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM ROEMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE

STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. Chairman, let me start by saying that it is a privilege to serve on this subcommittee and I look forward to working with you, and the rest of the panel, to address the education issues facing our country. As we begin the task of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, I think it is important that we search for and utilize aggressive and creative approaches to transforming the manner in which we teach our children to learn.

Education is how we, as a society, hand out lifestyle opportunities to our children. If we do not respond to the changing needs of our Nation's schools, our children will fail to fulfill the promise we hold for them. We will lose the gains that previous generations have accomplished in the advancement of education.

Like many of my colleagues on this committee, I have spent countless hours attending elementary and secondary schools in my district. I also recently spent a day visiting inner-city schools in Chicago. While these schools may be vastly different in terms of what students and educators are confronted with, they share a common sense of frustration at wanting to do better but lacking the resources needed to do it.

Today, I will be very interested to hear the recommendations of the witnesses and their suggestions on how we, who have the opportunity to dramatically change education, can best prompt States to modify their educational systems in order to achieve real reform.

Chairman KILDEE. I now call upon Gene Green from Texas, a new member of the committee. During his campaign I know he campaigned very, very hard for better schools, and he sought out this subcommittee.

Mr. Green?

Mr. GREEN. I, like Congressman Roemer, am proud to be on the committee for my first term. I asked for the committee, having served a number of years in the Texas Legislature and in the Texas Senate going through our school reform programs in Texas like a lot of other States, and I hope to be able to use that experience in Congress to do the same thing on a national level since that a lot of us have experienced as State legislators.

I know particularly the issue this morning is something near and dear to the hearts of a lot of us in Congress, particularly those of us who have fought these issues in the legislature and now are looking forward to providing both the quality that the ranking member talked about, but also the broadness to cover as many chil-

dren as possible, particularly when you come from an urban district like I have in Houston.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you. I now call on Congresswoman Woolsey from California. During her campaign she, like me, campaigned for some prudent cuts in our military and for increased spending on education. She like myself realizes that the Pentagon never had to have a bake sale to buy a bomber.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am absolutely delighted to be on your subcommittee. I think this is where some of the most important work is going to be taken over the next 2 years.

During my campaign I really made by campaign people nervous. I would go to the Sierra Club with my talks, and they would say, "Now, Lynn, what is your number one priority?" and I would say, "Education is my number one priority." And I mean it. I mean it down to the bottom of my toes. So what? Who cares about our environment unless they are educated? We must educate our children.

I am looking forward to a vital Congress that will make our children be first. I am looking forward to being able to have children enter the classroom ready to learn, so that they feel safe, they are nourished and they are healthy by the time they get into the classroom. And then I am looking forward to programs that encourage quality education for all of our children.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you.

Our next member to speak is Congressman Becerra, who in his campaign in California campaigned strongly on the issue of education.

Congressman?

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to echo the remarks of my colleagues and also congratulate the Chair, and Mr. Goodling as well, on the work that they have done in the past. I am looking forward especially this year, because of the reauthorization that we will be doing, to working with all of the members on this committee, and also the folks that we will be working as both witnesses and people in education.

For me in California the whole issue of education is perhaps a little bit more pronounced than most. We have a State where our annual growth rate in our student population, K-12, exceeds the entire student population of some States. We also have a school system in California where you need to speak in some cases up to 100 languages if you want to be able to communicate with every child that goes to school in California.

So I am very interested in working with this committee to try to establish some good guidelines for Federal funding of schools, especially for those who come with some special needs, whether it be limited English proficiency or perhaps some special need because of a disability. I am very much looking forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and the rest of the members.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you. And one of the younger but very senior members of the committee already, Mr. Sawyer from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you recognizing my presence here, and I will yield back whatever time I may have.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much.

All right. At that then we will begin our testimony, and we will begin with Commissioner Boysen.

**STATEMENTS OF COMMISSIONER THOMAS C. BOYSEN, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY; WILLIAM S. WOODSIDE, CHAIRMAN, SKY CHEFS, INC., NEW YORK, NEW YORK; AND MICHAEL KIRST, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA**

Commissioner BOYSEN. Thank you. Chairman Kildee, Mr. Goodling, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today on behalf of the 57 State superintendents of public instruction and Commissioners of Education who make up the Council of Chief State School Officers.

You are now authorizing programs which began more than a quarter century ago. Let me provide a perspective on the challenge of reauthorization based on my education work, including 20 years as a school superintendent in Washington State, New York, and California.

In the summer of 1962, I stood on the White House lawn with other recent college graduates and a young American President. We were heading off to service in the dream that a young, powerful country could help still younger countries just emerging into their independence. My destination was Africa, where I taught in Uganda and Kenya for 3 years. That was a time when America served humankind by turning outward, and I was privileged to see in the faces of my students the inspiration they drew from a great and generous country. It was that same spirit and commitment that inspired the passage in 1965 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide opportunity at home as we worked for it abroad.

Now, we are considering anew the Federal role in elementary, secondary, and vocational education. Three decades of rapid social, economic, geopolitical and environmental change have transformed the needs and challenges of education. In the 1960s, equal educational opportunity was a moral imperative. In the 1990s, it has become an economic imperative. In the 1960s, the focus was on raising student performance for the economically disadvantaged to the level of more affluent populations. In the 1990s, we must raise the performance level of the entire population with special attention to special needs students.

The central issue here is this: Over the past three decades, more than 45 separate programs have been established and now are incorporated in the Hawkins-Stafford amendments. Several of the programs serve the same students, but each program has its own purposes, ground rules, guidelines, thus providing disconnected services.

I attach to my statement detailed proposals for the entire reauthorization. Let me address the central challenges to which our proposal is focused.

Number one is impact. The aggregate impact of programs serving special needs students must be stronger. It must be better sustained.

Number two is leverage. Federal programs must be directed simultaneously to raise the capacity of the entire system for higher order learning and to assist the special needs populations. Federal funds comprise about 6 percent of total elementary and secondary spending, so they must leverage those local and State dollars to improve results.

And third, coordination. Federal support for elementary and secondary education through Hawkins-Stafford and other laws must be better coordinated. The Kentucky Education Reform Act passed in 1990 is in its third year of a 6-year roll-out to radically transform 15 different major programs in school finance, school and school district governance, and curriculum.

Radical change in teaching and learning is right in the center of the reform path. For example, Kentucky's 200,000 students who are ages 5 to 9 and their 8,500 teachers are experiencing a new pedagogical order, the continuous progress, non-graded primary school. The typical classroom is not one where rows of students face a teacher for instruction for most of the day with a few pulled out for supplemental services. Instead, for example, an 8-year-old boy might be reading aloud to a 6-year-old girl in a corner of the classroom, while nearby a 7-year-old girl kneels beside a heavy encyclopedia trying to research dinosaurs. Across the room children would be gathered in a group using straw, marbles and other items to work mathematic problems and to internalize some of those concepts in meanings. And at the computer station 3 children are clustered, one doing math problems, another making a journal entry, and a third designing a logo for her work group.

KERA's continuous progress primary schools abandon the lock-step, winners-and-losers approach defined by grades K, 1, 2, 3 and the spectrum of separate subjects. Instead an integrated success-oriented curriculum is organized around themes which teach content in the context of problem-solving.

Students move at their own direction and pace toward KERA's learning goals. One teacher of 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds put it this way, saying "Last year my students were learning to read. This year they are reading to learn."

Special needs students in this environment and their teachers are included as much as possible. A major intention of KERA is to have all children succeed in a regular classroom, with special services available there as well as beyond the traditional school day and year, and even beyond the facility. Federal programs such as Chapter I, migrant and homeless education, and adult literacy do today provide critical support for these special services. Achieving the goals of KERA requires profound changes in the materials, methods and techniques used in classrooms. Vital to those changes are the programs such as Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower math and science program.

Yet we must go much farther to achieve maximum effect of local, State and Federal efforts. For example, the authority for localities and States to consolidate "clustered" Federal programs improves program operation and integration. Also linked planning across titles and several Federal Acts enhances the quality of teaching and comprehensive services for students and their families. And third, the expansion of opportunities for schoolwide projects and the emphasis on overall school improvement enables Federal programs to raise the quality of performance of entire schools.

A second major reform area is linking schools to social, health and justice services. Hunger and malnutrition, child abuse, illness, inadequate clothing, poor vision, bad teeth, missing child support, and emotional trauma are all serious impediments to learning. The KERA Family Resource/Youth Service Centers—we call them "friskies" because that is the mind-set they want to create in children—act as air traffic controllers for poor children and their families who need help, using a very complicated human services network. These center coordinators, who come from the communities, refer families and youth to existing social, health, welfare and justice services. The centers create powerful efficiencies to use already existing services. What is needed is to expand these vital linkages between schools and social service networks in Kentucky and other States.

One, we need the authority to coordinate categorical programs aimed at prevention of risk behaviors. Two, a more general authority to use medicaid funds to provide preventive health services in schools with high concentrations of eligible students. And three, we need a catalyst to establish and expand the system of school-based or school-linked health and social services like Kentucky's. The Chief's proposals include the "Schools Serving Students, Families, and Communities, a new initiative to catalyze this connection.

And our third powerful program that I am going to reference today is that of high standards and authentic assessment. Kentucky has adopted a performance-based student assessment system to measure progress toward statewide goals in a high stakes accountability system. For students, this means not paper-and-pencil, multiple-choice tests. They have been replaced with portfolios, with performance events, and with short answer questions. Students are motivated, teachers are focused. The initial results have been somewhat disconcerting. About 90 percent of the students on the basis of their first year's work fall into the two bottom categories: novice and apprentice. Our goal in these 2 years is to increase by at least 10 percent the share of students who are proficient or distinguished on our scales. Adoption of clear statewide standards to achieve national goals and reliance on authentic assessment advances equity and excellence for all students. It raises expectations, measures the meaningful and focuses on what students can do with what they learn. Clear focus on the learning challenge becomes a magnet around which all the other resources of the schools—time, technology, training, materials, homework, grades, and recognition—orient themselves. Such focus is the best way to use existing resources to create greater equity and excellence.

The effect of existing Federal programs has been to discourage the use of such statewide performance-based standards and authentic assessment. Chapter 1 drives a lot of the assessment in all of education, and it is fastened on all ways of measuring that disconnect the learner and the content and segregate the curriculum.

The Chiefs recommend a new High-Performance Learning Act. Title 1 of that Act would be opportunity for all to learn, and that would include the programs that pay special attention to the most needy children and would hold schools and States and districts accountable for getting results for those students.

Title 2, high performance for all, includes recommendations aimed at raising the quality of the entire educational system, including Chapter 2, magnet schools, and the Eisenhower Math and Science Act, as forces driving that change.

Title 3, healthy students/safe schools, includes programs that link education with health, social service and community activities.

Title 4, includes programs administered directly by the U.S. Department of Education that support education research, development and innovation.

For each of the three clusters for the first titles, States and localities would be required to have plans indicating strategies for consolidation and integration. The Chiefs also urge a Federal education for 1993 that calls for several companion pieces in addition to the Hawkins-Stafford reauthorization. These include enactment of the key provisions of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act which were blocked in the Senate at the end of the last session.

We urge also a fiscal year 1993 supplemental appropriation to implement the goals, standards and systems change bill and to fund Title 5 of the Higher Education Act. One third of this decade is gone and there is not yet any effective Federal intervention to achieve the national goals. We cannot wait until the 1994-95 year for that action.

The Chiefs and education reformers across the Nation encourage you to act decisively to lead another great American education revolution. The first revolution began in the 1830s and the 1840s in Massachusetts with the initiation of the "common school" movement by legislator and politician and educator Horace Mann. The main conviction of that campaign was that every child had a right to attend school. Today's systemic approach to education reform demands far more of us on behalf of our children. Its principal belief is that all children have the right to succeed in school. Its key assumption is that all children can learn at high levels.

Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Commissioner Boysen follows:]

Dr. Thomas C. Boysen  
Commissioner of Education  
Commonwealth of Kentucky

Chairman Kildee, Mr. Goodling, members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the fifty-seven superintendents and commissioners of education who make up the Council of Chief State School Officers. The proposals in this testimony and the accompanying report I am submitting were unanimously approved at the Council's annual meeting in November of 1992. I will comment on these proposals in relation to our work in Kentucky's education reform and the importance of federal programs to advance our work.

You are now reauthorizing programs which began more than a quarter century ago. Let me provide a perspective on the challenge of reauthorization based on my education career that began with teaching in Africa and includes 20 years as a school superintendent in Washington State, New York, and California.

In the summer of 1962, I stood on the White House lawn with other recent college graduates and a young American President. We were heading off to service with the dream that a young, powerful country could work in still younger countries just emerging into their own independence. My destination was Africa, where I spent three years teaching in Uganda and Kenya. That was a time when America served humankind by turning outward, and I was privileged to see in the faces of my students the inspiration they drew from our great and generous country. That same spirit and commitment inspired the passage in 1965 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide opportunity at home as we worked for it abroad.

Now, you are considering anew the federal role in elementary, secondary, and vocational education. Three decades of rapid economic, social, geopolitical, and environmental change have transformed the needs and challenges of education. In the 1960's, equal educational opportunity was a moral obligation. In the 1990's, it has become an economic imperative. In the 1960's, the focus was raising student performance for the economically disadvantaged to the level of more affluent populations. In the 1990's, we must raise the performance level of the entire population with even greater efforts for individuals identified as needing extra assistance to meet the new standards.

This Hawkins-Stafford reauthorization is the most significant since the original enactment of many of the programs in the early 1960's. It provides the 103rd Congress and the new Administration with an extraordinary opportunity to restructure the major federal elementary, secondary, and adult education programs.

The central issue before the Subcommittee follows: Over the past three decades, more than 45 separate categorical programs have been established and are now incorporated in the Hawkins/Stafford Amendments. Several of the programs serve the same students, but each program has its own separate purpose and ground rules, thus providing disconnected service. In some cases program requirements initially believed beneficial are now counter-productive.



States and localities are making substantial changes through their own reforms and establishment of their own programs, which are often similar to the federal programs. Federal, state and local programs must be put in "sync." The objectives of each program must be met, but the impact of all of the efforts together must yield effective, sustained results. Comprehensive restructuring and systematic change in our schools requires new flexibility in implementing federal programs. Federal, state, and local funds must be pulled together to accomplish specific objectives and to produce top quality schools for all students.

Our proposals are based upon an emerging consensus of the organizational and educational practices necessary to create world-class schools. In the new system, success and accountability are determined by results. Students and their educators have the latitude to get the job done their way. The new model exemplifies the spirit of schooling, expressed by Patricia Graham, former dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education: "For the last 150 years, we've held the pedagogy constant and let the results vary; in the future, we've got to vary the pedagogy and have high standards of accomplishment for all."

The Council urges a comprehensive revision of the entire set of Hawkins/Stafford programs as the "High Performance Learning Act." Our proposal is built on the strengths of existing programs and is designed around the concept of clustering federal programs with similar characteristics to authorize states and localities the option of consolidating them with one another and with state and local programs. The concept maintains the "categorical" characteristics of key federal programs, such as targeting towards identified population groups and to particular uses of funds. Separate line item appropriations would be continued for each of the categorical programs, and unique programmatic features would be retained. By clustering programs that have similar characteristics under the several titles of a new bill, the legislation gives states and localities the flexibility to consolidate federal programs in ways that effectively serve the intended populations and uses.

Our recommendations will increase opportunities for schoolwide projects in areas with a high concentration of special needs children. The potential for overall school improvement is stressed because it is becoming increasingly clear that separate programs have limited impact if they are in a school that lacks schoolwide quality. A change in the assessment and accountability systems will enable evaluation of the aggregate effect of federal programs, rather than project-by-project results. The restructured federal programs will stimulate a performance-based education enterprise.

I attach to my statement detailed proposals for the entire reauthorization. These were presented to your full Committee last December 1, 1992. There is not time here to review the details of the comprehensive design, but let me address the central challenges to which our proposal is addressed on the basis of experiences in Kentucky and the other states.

- (1) The student populations identified in current law as needing special federal assistance are not fully-served. Too few students eligible for service under

several different federal programs are receiving integrated and coordinated federal, state and local services. The aggregate impact of programs serving identified student populations must be stronger and sustained.

- (2) Our nation's elementary and secondary education system is not achieving at the necessary high performance level. Federal programs must be directed simultaneously to raise the capacity of the entire system for higher order learning and to assist identified populations to reach the higher standards expected of all students. Federal funds comprise about 6% of total elementary/secondary spending, so they must leverage local and state dollars to improve results.
- (3) Federal support for elementary and secondary education through Hawkins/Stafford and other laws must be more effectively coordinated for better student performance. This requires coordination among the Hawkins/Stafford programs; the Higher Education Act/Title V, staff development; Office of Educational Research and Improvement programs; systemic reforms; and new initiatives to support National Goals, standards, school-to-work transition and comprehensive health, social and education services.

I commend you for focusing this hearing, the first of the 103rd Congress on Hawkins-Stafford reauthorization, on state reform and the role of federal programs in state systemic change and restructuring efforts. Let me establish the need and potential for doing this with examples from our work in Kentucky.

## THE KENTUCKY EDUCATION REFORM ACT (KERA)

Kentucky's experience with our Education Reform Act (KERA) is in year three of a six-year initiative to radically transform fifteen major state programs involving school finance, governance and curriculum. This affects 640,000 students in 1,400 schools, served by 45,000 educators in 176 districts. Although it will be September before we see the first objective evidence of student performance under reform, we detect already profound changes in educational practice and student motivation. Let me provide examples of the changes and suggest ways reauthorization can support our reforms.

### I. Radical Change in Teaching and Learning

**KERA Program: Continuous Progress Primary School.** Kentucky's 200,000 students between the ages of 5 and 9 and 8,500 primary teachers are experiencing a new pedagogical order: the continuous progress, non-graded primary school. The "typical" classroom at schools such as Arlington Elementary in Lexington is not one where rows of students face a teacher for instruction most of the day, with a few pulled out for supplemental services or involved in reading groups. Instead, an 8-year-old boy might be reading aloud to a 6-

year-old girl in one corner of the classroom, while nearby, a 7-year-old girl kneels beside a heavy encyclopedia she is using for research on dinosaurs. Across the room, a few children gathered around a table chat as they use straws, marbles and other items to work through their mathematics problems together. At the computer station, three children are clustered; one does math problems, another a journal entry, and the third designs a logo for his work group.

The principal, Robin Fankhauser, spends more time in the classrooms these days, now that discipline referrals to her office have fallen to their lowest levels in five years. Fankhauser sums up her assessment of the increased confidence and success she is seeing when she says of a 7-year-old's essay, "The child had dialogue in her story. I would not expect that from a student a few years older." The gains in writing evidenced at the primary level are mirrored throughout Kentucky's elementary and high schools through KERA's integrated curriculum and reliance on new assessments.

KERA's continuous progress primary schools abandon the lock-step program defined by grades kindergarten through 3 and curriculum based on separate subjects, such as reading, writing, grammar, mathematics, social studies, science, art, music, and physical education. Replacing the outmoded "cellular curriculum" is an integrated curriculum, with learning organized around themes that teach content in the context of solving problems alone and with others. Students move at their own direction and pace toward the six learning goals that KERA measures. One teacher of six- and seven-year olds said that last year her "students were learning to read; this year they are reading to learn."

Every student is in a multi-age, multi-ability classroom where the diversity of learners requires a family approach and one lesson from the teacher is applied in many ways by students. Special needs students with disabilities or educational disadvantages and their specialist teachers are included in regular student groupings to the maximum feasible extent. Collaborative learning and teaching are on the rise, and teachers report higher expectations for learners, as they see the rapid progress younger children make when tackling the work with the support of older children.

**KERA Program: Extended School Services.** Children have different rates of learning and the extended services program is designed to provide those who need additional instruction with individualized services before and after school, on Saturdays and during the summer. At Butler County Middle School in western Kentucky, Jeff stood head and shoulders above his classmates, though not because he was known for academic achievement. He was nearly 16 years old and the others were 12 and 13. Jeff spent two years in fifth grade, two years in sixth grade and two years in seventh grade. He had low self-esteem and moved ahead only because of his age, size and social development. A sudden interest in athletics, requiring better grades to compete, prompted him to ask for help. With special attention from KERA's Extended School Services program, Jeff walks tall now for the right reasons. The program's extra time for learning helped him earn a "B" average and a new outlook on school, himself and the future. Linda Hunt, Jeff's

mathematics teacher, says his reversal affirms the belief that "all children can learn, and the ones we might have had doubts about are proving that in extended school."

Programs may emphasize academic improvement, better attendance, physical and mental well-being, coursework for credit or for sustaining acquired skills. It is not a substitute for regular school time, nor does it offer enrichment activities for children achieving at the appropriate level.

In spring 1991-92, more than 96,000 Kentucky students were served by extended school programs, with 40 percent showing academic improvement by one or more letter grades in the subject of focus. Each of the 176 school districts receives a grant to provide the services, with the districts determining how to allocate the money within the system. Funding is determined by a formula that includes average daily attendance, dropout and economic deprivation rates and scores on the most recent statewide assessments. Additionally, a portion of the state grant funds are reserved for innovative programs, with 26 such awards given in 1992-93. Accountability for these special funds is based not on how they are used, but on the results the school achieves with special needs children.

**Impact of Federal Programs.** A major intention of KERA is to have all children succeed in a regular classroom with special services available there, as well as beyond the traditional school day and facility, where necessary, to provide each child opportunity to learn. Federal programs such as Chapter 1, migrant and homeless education, adult literacy, and others provide critical support for these special services. Achieving the goals of KERA requires profound changes in the materials, methods, and technologies used in classrooms and schools across Kentucky. The Hawkins-Stafford programs aimed at high performance learning for all through improved instruction, including Chapter 2, the Eisenhower math and science program, and Star Schools, are vital to these efforts, particularly through professional development.

In some instances, there is good meshing of state-federal efforts that permit the kind of innovative, comprehensive approaches cited in the previous two examples. Through recent changes in federal rules, for example, regular teachers and Chapter 1 teachers now may switch roles and work together in the same classroom, a great advance over the former system that segregated Chapter 1 by requiring its teachers to work only with Chapter 1 students.

Yet we must go much farther to achieve maximum effect of local-state-federal efforts to offer all students opportunity to learn in high performance schools. In three key ways the flexibility we advocate in our Hawkins/Stafford proposals would benefit states implementing changes to include all learners in a common, top quality context:

- (1) The authority for localities and states to consolidate "clustered" federal programs improves program operation and integration at the school and classroom level.

- (2) Linked planning across titles and several federal acts enhances the quality of teaching and comprehensive services for students and their families.
- (3) The expansion of opportunity for schoolwide projects and emphasis on overall school improvement enables federal programs to raise the quality of performance of entire schools.

## II. Schools Linked to Social, Health, and Justice Services

**KERA Program: Family Resource/Youth Services Centers.** KERA's 222 Family Resource/Youth Services Centers respond to the premise that healthy, alert children are better learners. It was the only place Joe Joe's mother had to turn the day she walked into Byck Elementary in Jefferson County, the state's largest urban area. Joe Joe had just undergone surgery for a tumor in his inner ear and needed expensive medication. His family's financial plight was made more desperate when they arrived home from the hospital to find power company representatives preparing to shut off power because of nonpayment.

Quick response by Stephany Hoover, coordinator of the Family Resource Center at Byck Elementary, provided the family with referrals, donations and comfort. Joe Joe's mother calls Ms. Hoover a "rock to lean on." She says she can only guess what might have happened to the family in that crisis without the help of the Resource Center.

Hunger and malnutrition, child abuse, illness, inadequate clothing, poor vision, bad teeth, missing child support and emotional trauma are all serious impediments to learning. The KERA centers are located in or near 414 schools with populations of 20% or more economically-deprived students. They act as "air traffic controllers" for children and families who need help using the complicated human services network. Center directors refer families and youth to existing social, health, welfare and justice services. The centers create powerful efficiencies by connecting service networks with clients.

**Impact of Federal Programs.** Current federal programs, such as the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act under Hawkins-Stafford, Medicaid, the Center for Disease Control HIV education program, and others provide valuable support for state efforts toward comprehensive health education and necessary links for students and their families with the health and social services they need. A positive meshing of state-federal efforts is found in the use of federal funds through programs such as Medicaid to place health professionals in the KERA service centers. These professionals remain employees of health clinics but their placement in schools get them much closer to their clients. There is also Chapter 1 authority to support the learning of participating children through the services of social workers, counselors, parent training, etc.

What is needed, however, to expand vital linkages between schools and the health/social service system in Kentucky is 1) the authority to coordinate the categorical

programs aimed at prevention of risk behaviors for substance abuse, teen pregnancy, AIDs, and others toward a comprehensive health education program; 2) a more general authority to use Medicaid funds to provide preventive health services in schools with high concentrations of eligible students and families; and 3) a catalyst to establish and expand a system of school-based or school-linked health and social services like Kentucky's nationwide. CCSSO proposals contain provisions to address all three needs, including a new initiative entitled, "Schools Serving Students, Families, and Communities" to authorize support for the type of centers KERA has established in my state.

### III. High Standards and Authentic Assessment

**KERA Program: Performance-Based Goals and Assessment.** Kentucky has adopted performance-based student assessment to measure progress toward statewide goals, in a high-stakes accountability system based on each school's two-year progress. For students at Pikeville Elementary School in eastern Kentucky, this means that paper and pencil, multiple choice tests have been replaced with portfolios that students use to become self-assessors, and simulated tasks, such as using labeling information to select the healthiest bottled drink from among several or estimating the cost of items purchased at a drug store. Moreover, students are motivated; as one fourth-grader put it, "This is fun! Can we do this every day?"

The initial results of the new testing system show how far we have to go in Kentucky to achieve our goals of high performance. 50,000 fourth graders, 50,000 fifth graders, and 40,000 twelfth graders are tested in three dimensions of learning: short answer/essay; individual and group performance events; and the collections of student work in writing and math portfolios. Student and school scores are reported on an absolute scale rising from novice to apprentice to proficient to distinguished. The first-year, 1991-92 results of the new testing program found 90% of the students ranking in the first two categories. Yet parents, the general public, and educators have accepted these results and focused on changing teaching for better results.

Adoption of clear, statewide standards to achieve national goals and reliance on "authentic" assessment advances equity and excellence for all students. It raises expectations, measures the meaningful and focuses on what students can do with what they learn. Clear focus on the learning challenge becomes a magnet around which school resources of time, technology, training, materials, homework, grades and recognition orient themselves. Such focus is the best way to use existing resources to create greater equity for special needs students.

**Impact of Federal Programs.** The effect of the federal education programs so essential to educational equity and excellence in Kentucky has been, unfortunately, to discourage use of statewide, performance-based standards and authentic assessment. Chapter 1, the largest program, drives accountability for all federal programs and, too often, for state and local programs as well. Its requirement that schools use standardized, norm-

referenced tests increases dependency on multiple choice formats that do not require thoughtful responses, do not measure performance over time, are misaligned with the local curriculum, and fail to encourage collaborative problem-solving. Schools that want to use authentic assessment must double-test. Moreover, the individual, varying accountability and evaluation requirements of the more than 45 Hawkins/Stafford programs discourage both comprehensive planning and goal-setting, as well as integrated, comprehensive assessment systems.

The existent Hawkins/Stafford programs that serve the same or similar population or purpose must be restructured in the new statute in a way that will enable comprehensive planning for maximum program impact; adoption of the same high performance goals, standards, and authentic assessments for all students and schools; and integration of services.

## THE HIGH PERFORMANCE LEARNING ACT

Using these examples of Kentucky reform, I have illustrated the major concepts of our proposal for reauthorization. May I conclude my remarks with a brief overview of the new structure we recommend for more effective results from the 45 Hawkins/Stafford programs. We propose five titles for the Act.

**Title 1 -- Opportunity for All to Learn.** The Council recommendations cluster the Hawkins/Stafford programs under four of the five titles. The first title, "Opportunity for All to Learn," includes programs that provide additional assistance to identified student populations to assure they learn at the same level expected of all students under standards established by the states. This cluster would include programs such as Chapter 1, adult and bilingual education. Consolidating programs would permit states and localities to integrate services to students eligible for more than one program.

**Title 2 -- High Performance Schools for All.** The second title, "High Performance Schools for All," includes programs aimed at raising the quality of the entire educational system. Its programs include Chapter 2, Magnet Schools, and the Eisenhower Math and Science program. The option to consolidate programs under this title would strengthen the capacity of schools, school districts and states to make systemic changes through establishment of standards and frameworks; professional development; and learning technologies. This is an essential federal role in education at this time.

**Title 3 -- Healthy Students/Safe Schools.** The third title, "Healthy Students/Safe Schools," includes programs that link education with health, social service and community activities. Its programs include the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, as well as a new program providing the support to connect major federal funding programs, such as Medicaid. Its focus is to enable schools to provide quality, comprehensive services for children and their families on school sites or in appropriate community locations.

**Title 4 -- R & D, Learning Technology, and Education Indicators.** This cluster includes programs administered directly by the United States Education Department to support education research and development, innovative projects, multi-state learning technology initiatives, and education data systems. This proposal, linked with reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, would provide better alignment of nationwide support and activities.

For each of the first three clusters, states and localities would be required to have plans indicating strategies for consolidation. They would be encouraged to have single plans across clusters and to link those plans with their use of funds under the Higher Education Act, Title V. Additionally, use of federal funds under each title should be linked to state and district plans for systemic reform.

We propose also extensive revisions of many of the separate proposals such as Chapter 1 and the Adult Education Act. The details of these revisions are included in our report and side-by-side.

### Related CCSSO Proposals

Our Council urges that the reauthorization of Hawkins/Stafford be completed with a comprehensive approach to shaping federal programs to help students meet the National Education Goals. Our Federal Agenda for Education, 1993 summarizes the parts of the overall program. In particular, we note several companion pieces to the Hawkins/Stafford reauthorization, including enactment of the key provisions of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, which were blocked in the Senate at the end of the last session. The provisions are to codify the National Education Goals; establish federal policies to achieve the goals; develop performance standards and assessments; authorize state-by-state NAEP; and support school, school district, and state education reform and through systemic reform plans, to support state efforts to make more effective use of existing resources.

We urge also a FY 93 supplemental appropriation (\$200 million) to implement the goals, standards, and systems change bill and to fund Title V of the Higher Education Act (\$350 million) to begin in-service staff development as early as summer, 1993. One third of the decade is gone and there is not yet any actual federal intervention to achieve the Goals. We cannot wait until school year 1994-95 for action.

The chiefs and education reformers across the nation encourage you to act decisively to lead another great education revolution which prepares American students for the 21st Century. The first revolution began in the 1830's and 40's in Massachusetts, with the initiation of the "common school" movement by educator/politician Horace Mann. The main conviction of that campaign was that every child had the right to attend a school. Today's systemic approach to education reform demands far more on behalf of children.



Its principal belief is that all children have the right to succeed in school. Its key assumption is that all children can learn at high levels.

In Kentucky, we are banking on KERA's systemic approach to stimulate huge changes in the state's economy, mainly by producing a new generation of world-class thinkers, problem solvers, workers. Enactment of the reauthorized Hawkins/Stafford Amendments we propose would provide us with more effective use of federal programs and greater resources to succeed. It would give strength to achieve educational success for all of America's children.

Thank you. I look forward to answering your questions about KERA and our Council's proposals.

Chairman KILDEE. Before we go on to the next witness, I would like to indicate that we have been joined by another member of the subcommittee, Major Owens of New York, and by Governor Carlos A. Romero-Barcelo from Puerto Rico, and from California, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, and also from the State of Rhode Island, Jack Reed.

Our next witness is William Woodside. Mr. Woodside?

Mr. WOODSIDE. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and committee members. My name is William Woodside and I am chairman of Sky Chefs. I also serve on the Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development, and I am chairman of the board of the Institute for Educational Leadership here in Washington.

Just about 6 years ago I sat before this subcommittee with four of my fellow colleagues from business to support the extension and expansion of Chapter 1 in the belief that we were not doing enough to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in this country. At the time it was considered unusual for a group of senior executives from Fortune 500 companies to testify on behalf of an education program. Now, of course, business leaders are deeply involved in education reform around the entire country.

You have asked me to address three questions: What is happening in school reform? What is the role of the Federal Government in school reform? And how should existing programs be modified in the interest of school reform? I am much more interested in talking about the future and what to do than I am about discussing the past. The past has been covered pretty thoroughly, at least from my perspective, in the memorandum and the testimony that you have before you. So I will, to say the least, condense that dramatically.

I think it is enough to say that since 1983 we have had three different waves of school reform. We are now in the middle of the third wave. The first was trying to do a little bit more of what we were already doing and to improve the practitioners in the field of education.

The second, since that didn't seem to produce much in the way of results, as we measured it, in terms of SAT scores and dropouts and the rest, was to say there must be something wrong with the process. So then we started the whole school restructuring movement, which really dealt with empowering, if you will, teachers and parents by local school district to have more of a say in curriculum and hours and the way in which they dealt with their classrooms and less bureaucracy. That also didn't seem to have much of a payoff.

So we finally moved to the third area, which I think is the most important of all, and that is what happens to a child between conception and the time he enters school is one of the key determining factors of how he is going to come out of the education process at the end of the 12th grade.

Now, there are a lot of specific programs underway today. You have just heard the gentleman from Kentucky discuss some of the things that are going on in that State. Mike Kirst, who follows me, is going to discuss some of the things going on in California. But these are just two of the interesting specifics on the education front today.

The States of Oregon, Washington, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Kentucky, Arizona, and South Carolina have completed or are in the process of enacting major reform legislation. In a number of these instances, business leaders, including those from the CED and the Business Roundtable, have played a significant role. We have seen some successes. Many of them have come at the school building or district level. In some cases we have even seen the entire State improve. In South Carolina, where system reform has been underway for quite sometime under the leadership of Governor Riley, students improve their performance on the SAT by an average of 40 points between 1983 and 1989. College attendance increased by 7 percent, and between 1984 and 1991 the number of students who pass through the system doubled.

Now, of all the three areas that I have discussed, the one that I believe shows considerable progress is that in preparing young children for school. It was not until Brad Butler and my CED colleagues emphasized the importance of early investment in children that this issue took hold, and that programs like Head Start, early childhood immunizations, and WIC came to the fore. They existed before but it took a dramatic push to really get them the attention they deserved.

Now, if I look at the three waves, I have to say there is not much to crow about. While most agree that systemic reform is required to produce outcomes like those in South Carolina, it appears that political leaders in most States and at most local levels have been unwilling to get ahead of their voters. State leaders and more often State legislatures have had, with some notable exceptions, avoided establishing statewide standards that are too high, fearing that high failure rates might cost them their jobs. State policymakers also do not relish shaking up the institutional structures in the face of politically influential and vested interests at the State and local levels. And local superintendents, God help them, who serve at the will of popularly elected school boards are also often reluctant to make significantly tougher curricular standards for fear of parent or other constituent resistance.

Now, what all this signifies is that, unhappily, the American voter does not seem to care enough, or perhaps I should say know enough, to pressure for change. This unhappy fact was roundly confirmed by a Harris poll commissioned in 1991 by the CED and the Pough Foundation. This extensive poll—these seem to be glued together—indicated that while most employers lamented the quality of the product coming out of the schools, parents felt just the opposite. That schools were doing a pretty good, and sometimes an excellent, job in preparing their kids for work, higher education, or life.

And it seems to me, taking evidence from another poll that I haven't mentioned in the paper, which shows that if you ask parents what they think about education levels in the U.S. they will tell you that the education levels across the country are terrible. You ask them about their school district, they think their school district is terrific. So it is everybody is doing well except for mine—they are doing poorly, except for my district.

Now I find that very discouraging because that means that we are talking about a whole shift in the way people look and value

education in the U.S. if we are going to get a strong political base from parents in the U.S. Most parents don't know how to judge whether their child is learning up to world-class standards or not, and I must say I will be fascinated to see how parents have reacted in Kentucky where, as you just heard, only about 10 percent of the students fall out of the bottom two categories. So we are a long way, if we match our efforts against world-class standards.

Now, where does all this leave us? Everywhere and nowhere, I suspect. We have instances of real change and real gains in student performance in the midst of a lot of smoke and little overall improvement.

Now the next two questions, what should the Federal role be and what specific changes should we make in current programs, I am going to kind of combine together. Let me start by saying there are a few principles which I feel Federal education efforts should follow, and I think many of my colleagues in the business community will agree.

First, the Federal Government must be a leader without strangling States and localities with too many categoricals and too much regulation. In short, this means the Federal Government needs to help the American people understand better what we as a Nation expect of children and how our children are measuring up in a global economy. This means involving the Federal Government in the development of agreed-upon national standards and assessments. It means the Federal Government helping the States to set standards to develop curricular and school delivery standards, and to assist in professional development. This means the President and other key department heads must effectively use the bully pulpit if we are to make some kind of impact on a broad base.

Secondly, with limited resources to use as a safety net, education funds should be targeted to those schools and students most in need, and quality should rule over quantity and flexibility over categorization. This means reducing the number of categorical programs so that children are no longer segregated in "pull-outs," and so that teachers can establish child-specific programs that address the child as a whole, not a component part.

Third, only the Federal Government is in a position to carry out the research, development and dissemination functions across the U.S. Only the Federal Government is in a position to learn what works in one part of the country and get this information to other parts, and only the Federal Government can provide research and experimentation in the area of education on a scale that gives us useful information. This means that OERI needs to emphasize its educational role as much as its research role; to tie these activities to systemic change; to provide technical assistance to the localities who are attempting systemic change; and to keep in mind the role of R&D while considering the reauthorization of basic programs.

Fourth, really, and most importantly, all Federal programs need to be viewed in the way they address all the developmental needs of children from conception to graduation. We must stop passing laws under different statutes delivered by different agencies and departments which deal only with one part of a child at a time. Whether one has an educational deficiency, an income deficiency, a health deficiency, a nutritional deficiency, or even parental defi-

ciency, a child cannot learn effectively. This means we have got to stop the idiocy of having multiple programs that affect children's abilities to learn separate from those that are designed to teach them to learn.

The President has chosen impressive key Cabinet secretaries who could help him provide this collaborative leadership. As Governor of South Carolina, Secretary Riley demonstrated his clear understanding of the relationships between education and other services in building strong communities and the relationship between strong communities and a strong economy. Donna Shalala, the new Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, is also a leader in education as well as in children's issues. Hopefully, they will be able to develop greater interagency linkages and collaboration.

Revamping programs so that they make more sense will require tough choices and rigorous analysis. It means revisiting and perhaps radically revising funding streams and eligibility requirements, and it means including new players in the decisionmaking process. For example, the Department of Education should be a partner as other departments move ahead on policies that affect students. Upcoming legislative windows of opportunity for collaboration include congressional review of key laws that expire in 1994 or 1995, including Head Start, Food Stamp, WIC, and several major block grant programs.

The most obvious legislative vehicle for educational action to encourage collaboration in States and communities is the upcoming congressional reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which includes the \$6.7 billion Chapter 1 program for disadvantaged children. We are not suggesting setting up more bureaucratic structures or creating a separate categorical program called Collaboration, but rather weaving incentives for State and local approaches throughout the law.

For example, schools that effectively link education and other services for low income children could be tangibly rewarded with more money, more flexibility, or waivers from troublesome regulations. Other departments could and should join with the Department of Education in reshaping parts of ESEA with an eye towards reducing conflicting definitions, standards and procedures among programs, all of which after all serve the same children and families. For example, should all children in Chapter 1 schools be automatically eligible for medicaid? And how can reporting and accountability mechanisms be made more consistent and less cumbersome with more focus on outcomes and less on process?

Many of the same comments could be made about the WIC program. Participation in WIC improves the health of low income mothers and young children and saves money. In 1991, four other corporate leaders and I testified before the House Budget Committee to urge Congress to provide full funding of WIC by 1996. Our recommendation was based on findings of numerous studies and our concern about the future of the American workforce. Since that hearing additional studies have been completed which further substantiate the cost savings provided by the WIC program. Let me urge you to continue your support of WIC and to argue vigorously for its expansion. To ensure quality education prepares our chil-

dren to become contributing members of society, we must guarantee that children enter school ready to learn. Fully funding WIC is a good way to meet this guarantee.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, you appear to be facing a rather large education agenda in this Congress. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, OERI, NSF, Head Start, and the National Service Act, I am told, are all on the agenda, and there is likely to be a school-to-work transition bill involving some form of apprenticeship. It would seem to me that the business-as-usual mode of looking at all these programs separately under separate jurisdictions will not suffice. We should not only be looking at how to change existing programs, we should be looking at how these programs fit together to affect the overall development of a child from conception to graduation.

If this means completely changing our current structures, so be it. But, if we are to have true change in the schools, I believe this needs to be done.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify this morning.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Woodside.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Woodside follows:]

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WOODSIDE, CHAIRMAN, SKY CHEFS, INC.

Mr. Chairman, my name is William Woodside and I am Chairman of Sky Chefs, Inc. I also serve on the Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) and I am Chairman of the Board of the Institute for Educational Leadership.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to address this committee on the subject of education reform and the Federal role. It was just under 6 years ago that I sat here with four of my fellow colleagues from business to support the extension and expansion of Chapter I, in the belief that we were not doing enough to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in this country. At the time, it was considered unusual for a group of senior executives from Fortune 500 corporations to testify on behalf of an education program. Now, of course, business leaders are involved in education reform around the country.

You have asked me to address three questions: what is happening in school reform; what is the role of the Federal Government in school reform; and how should existing programs be modified in the interest of school reform.

Let me answer them in sequence. Today we seem to be in the midst of the second wave of reform since the issuance of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. The first wave, particularly with respect to K-12, concentrated on doing more of the same—i.e., we told Johnny to take 3 years of Math instead of two, or we had Susie stay in school a while longer, and then we judged how well we were doing by instituting statewide minimum competency tests. We also concentrated on trying to increase teacher performance by raising teaching standards. Indeed, by 1988 almost every State in the Union has increased standards for both students and teachers alike.

But we didn't seem to get much in the way of results. SAT test scores did not improve, dropout rates were reduced slightly, a few more students were taking Advanced Placement (AP) exams, and we seemed to be doing a little bit better on international comparisons, but not much. And the National Association for Educational Progress (NAEP) results kept telling us not only that we were more stupid than ever, but that we were more stupid than everyone else around the world.

In 1988 or thereabouts, we decided that all these efforts were not enough, and that what was needed was a restructuring of the schools—of the way educational services were being delivered. We determined that a major problem in the schools was a process one; that the heavy top-down bureaucratic nature of our public schools stifled creativity, and condemned students to outdated and irrelevant curricula; that teachers didn't have enough voice in determining what to teach or how to teach it; that they spent too little time teaching and too much time administering; and that the system was clogged with excessive administration and mandates. So in the last few years we have seen efforts to restructure the relationships between the central office and individual schools; between teachers in the classroom and their

principals; and between parents and the school. We have also made efforts to integrate services, including health and nutrition, at the school site. The Bush administration took the restructuring notion one step further, through the development of "break the mold" schools and the push for more market competition through private school choice.

Today we appear to have three distinct types of initiatives, which include aspects of these two reform "waves." They are: improving educational quality by raising standards for students, teachers, and schools and focusing on accountability (an effort in many instances spearheaded or at least strongly supported by the business community); restructuring schools as places of work and teaching as a profession; and focusing on the educational needs of at-risk children through the provision of early childhood programs and greater coordination between educational and social service.

There are numerous reform efforts underway. The States of Oregon, Washington, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Kentucky, Arizona, and South Carolina have completed or are in the process of enacting major reform legislation. In a number of instances business leaders, including those from the CED and the Business Roundtable, have played a significant role.

We have seen some successes. Many of them have come at the school building or district level. In some cases we have even seen the entire State improve. In South Carolina, where system reform has been underway for quite some time under the leadership of Governor Riley, students improved their performance on the SAT by an average of 40 points between 1983 and 1989; college attendance increased by 7 percent, and between 1984 and 1991 the number of students who passed doubled.

There is one area of reform where I believe we are making some considerable strides and that is in preparing young children for school. It was not until Brad Butler and my CED colleagues emphasized the importance of early investment in children that this issue took hold and that programs like Head Start, early childhood immunizations, and WIC came to the fore. I give considerable credit to Brad, who as you may know is the former Chairman of Procter & Gamble, for pointing out to many of us in the business community, who spend a good deal of time at the elementary and secondary level, that no matter how much we improve K-12 education, children will not benefit from school if they are not prepared to be there.

Generally, however, there is not much to crow about. While most agree that systemic reform is required to produce outcomes like those in South Carolina, it appears that political leaders at the State and local level have been unwilling to get ahead of their voters. State leaders, and more often State legislatures, have with some notable exceptions avoided establishing statewide standards that are too high, fearing that high failure rates might cost them their jobs. State policymakers also do not relish shaking up the institutional structures in the face of politically influential and vested interests at the State and local levels. And local superintendents, who serve at the will of popularly elected school boards, are also often reluctant to make significantly tougher curriculum standards for fear of parent or other constituent resistance.

What this all signifies is that, unhappily, the American voter does not seem to care enough—or perhaps I should say, *know* enough—to pressure for change. This unhappy fact was roundly confirmed by a Harris poll commissioned in 1991 by the Committee for Economic Development and the Pough Foundation (in cooperation with the Business Roundtable, the National Goals Panel and the National Council of Education Standards). This extensive poll indicated that while most employers lamented the quality of the product coming out of the schools, parents felt just the opposite—that the schools were doing a pretty good job, and sometimes an excellent job, in preparing their kids for work, higher education or life.

This is not to say that parents do not want to improve their schools. It does say they don't have enough information to judge how well their children are doing. Indeed, the same Harris poll shows that 88 percent believe we need high education standards to compete, and an overwhelming number, 82 percent, believe we need common national standards that allow them to compare their children's performance to world class standards. Yet the poll also reveals that parents do not believe that current high school standards are clear, and simply find that they do not know how to judge whether what their child is learning is set to world class standards or not. I will be fascinated to see how parents have reacted in Kentucky, where statewide tests base on world-class standards were passed on average by only 9 percent of the students.

Where does that leave us? Everywhere and nowhere, I suspect. We have instances of real change and real gains in student performance in the midst of a lot of smoke and little overall improvement.

This brings me to your next two questions: what should the Federal role be in assisting in education reform; and what specific changes should we make in current programs? Again, these are very large questions.

I believe there are a few principles which Federal education should follow. These are principles, I believe, that many of my colleagues in the business community would share.

First, the Federal Government must be a leader without strangling States and localities with too many categoricals and too much regulation. In short, this means the Federal Government needs to help the American people understand better what we as a Nation expect of children and how our children are measuring up in a global economy. This means involving the Federal Government in the development of agreed-upon national standards and assessments. It means the Federal Government helping the States to set standards, to develop curricula and school delivery standards, and to assist in professional development. And this means the President *effectively* using the bully-pulpit as well as key department heads.

Second, with limited resources to use as a safety net, education funds should be targeted to those schools and students most in need, and quality should rule over quantity and flexibility over categorization. This means reducing the number of categorical programs so that children are no longer segregated in "pull out" programs so that teachers can establish child-specific programs that address the child as a whole, not a component part. On the issue of equalization, I would *not* support the notion that Federal funds be denied to States that have not fully equalized because, in my view, this only penalizes children.

Third, only the Federal Government is in a position to carry out the research, development and dissemination functions. Only the Federal Government is in a position to learn what works in one part of the country and get this information to other parts of the country, and only the Federal Government can provide research and experimentation in the area of education on a scale that gives us useful information. This means that OERI needs to emphasize its educational role as much as its research role; to tie these activities to systemic change; to provide technical assistance to localities who are attempting systemic change; and to consider the role of R&D while debating the reauthorization of basic programs.

Fourth, all Federal programs need to be viewed in the way they address all the developmental needs of children, from conception to graduation. We must stop passing laws under different statutes, delivered by different agencies and departments, which deal only with one part of the child at a time. Whether it has an educational deficiency, income deficiency, health deficiency, or nutritional deficiency, or even parental deficiency, a child cannot learn effectively. This means that we have got to stop the idiocy of having multiple programs that affect children's *abilities* to learn separate from those that they are designed to *teach* them to learn.

The President has chosen impressive key cabinet secretaries who could help him provide this collaborative leadership. As governor of South Carolina, Secretary Riley demonstrated his clear understanding of the relationships between education and other services in building strong communities—and the relationship between strong communities and a strong economy. Donna Shalala, the new Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, is also a national leader in education as well as children's issues. Hopefully they will be able to develop greater interagency linkages and collaboration.

Revamping programs so that they make more sense will require tough choices and rigorous analysis. It means revisiting and perhaps radically revising funding streams and eligibility requirements. And it means including new players in the decisionmaking process. For example, the Department of Education should be a partner as other departments move ahead on policies that affect students. Upcoming legislative windows of opportunity for collaboration include Congressional review of key laws that expire in 1994 or 1995, including Head Start, Food Stamps, WIC and several major block grant programs.

The most obvious legislative vehicle for educational action to encourage collaboration in States and communities is the upcoming Congressional reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which includes the \$6.7 billion Chapter I program for disadvantaged children. We are not suggesting setting up more bureaucratic structures or creating a separate categorical program called "collaboration," but rather weaving incentives for State and local approaches throughout the law. For example, schools that effectively link education and other services for low-income children could be tangibly rewarded with more money, more flexibility, or waivers from troublesome regulations.

Other departments could and should join with the Department of Education in reshaping parts of ESEA, with an eye towards reducing conflicting definitions,



standards and procedures among programs—all of which, after all, serve largely the same children and families. For example: should all children in Chapter I schools be automatically eligible for medicaid? And how can reporting and accountability mechanisms be made more consistent and less cumbersome, with more focus on outcomes and less on process?

Many of the same comments could be made about the WIC program. Participation in WIC improves the health of low-income mothers and young children and saves money. In 1991, I and four other corporate leaders testified before the House Budget Committee to urge Congress to provide full funding of WIC by 1996. Our recommendation was based on findings of numerous studies and our concern about the future of the American workforce. We believe fully funded WIC will help ensure that the Nation meets the education goal of having all children who enter school in 2000 ready to learn. Since the hearing, additional studies have been completed which further substantiate the cost savings provided by the WIC program, and, I believe, the need to fully fund WIC.

I urge you to continue your support of the WIC program and to argue vigorously for its expansion. To ensure that quality education prepares our children to become contributing members of society, we must guarantee that children enter school ready to learn. Fully funding WIC is a good way to meet this guarantee.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, you appear to be facing a rather large education agenda in this Congress. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, OERI, NSF, Head Start, and the National Service Act, I am told, are all on the agenda. And there is likely to be school-to-work transition bill involving some form of apprenticeship.

It would seem to me that the business as usual mode of looking at all these programs separately under different jurisdictions would not suffice. We should not only be looking at how to change existing programs, we should be looking at how these programs fit together to affect the overall development of a child, from conception to graduation. If this means completely changing our current structure, so be it, but if we are to have true change in the schools I believe this needs to be done.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

Chairman KILDEE. Before we go on to the next witness, I really appreciate very much your pulling together the needs of that child from conception to graduation. Your own record has been great in the area of nutrition.

I have always said that people very often disagree on pro-life/pro-choice, but wherever they stand on that, one of the greatest pro-life programs is the WIC program. And I always try to get people who say they are pro-life to realize that they should be supporting WIC.

You pulled this together very, very well, and I appreciate that. I, with you, would hope that we would fully fund WIC. I can recall back in 1981 when they tried to cut the WIC program, and the reason they were trying to cut it—Department of Agriculture—is that they had found out there were more hungry pregnant women than they had anticipated and they couldn't afford it. What bad logic that was.

We have, fortunately, fought those cuts. But what we have to do is really fully fund WIC. That is a tremendous program. And I deeply appreciate your own personal concern for nutrition problems in this country. I appreciate your testimony.

Our next witness is Dr. Michael Kirst.

Mr. KIRST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Mike Kirst from Stanford University, and I also work with the Center for Policy Research in Education, a federally funded research center, and Policy Analysis for California Education, which I direct, which is funded by California foundations. We have been studying California education reform ever since 1983, and prior to that I was president of the State Board of Education in California.

I think when you look at education reform at the State level from California's perspective and then you glance at the Federal programs you come out with a view that some of the Federal programs are helpful, some of them are in conflict with what we are trying to do and move us in the opposite direction, and many of them are not terribly relevant to the major thrust of California reform.

I also believe that when you look at the formation of the Federal role it was essentially hammered in place between roughly 1965 and 1975, and it has a set of older concepts that are not terribly relevant or well adapted to our current attempts to reform California education.

The California reform bill, which was started—it was in 1983. It was typical of a lot of State reform legislation. It was an omnibus bill. It had 60 to 70 provisions, and it stressed improving the system through setting high curricular standards. California worked very hard on curricular frameworks. What kids should know and be able to do in various subjects. California has much more of a State-oriented, directed approach than some States. So we came out with a science framework, a math framework, history, social studies, and our attempts have been to link all our policies to those high student goals. So we created a textbook program which was aligned with these curricular statements, which were much more challenging than before. They stress synthesis, analysis, problem-solving, expository writing, complex reading, values curriculum, things of this sort. So we aligned our textbook program and then we also came in with a new assessment program to align with that to put the pieces together.

We also worked on helping prepare our teachers to teach this more challenging curriculum and several other innovations such as mentor teaching and beginner teacher assistance.

Now, what came out of this was, I think, some significant pushes forward. A lot of the changes in addition to the curriculum ones essentially used intensification. Take the existing system and intensify it. But in the curricular-teaching-learning area we tried to push forward in new and novel ways. We tracked very closely the ideas of the National goals and concepts such as systemic reform where the pieces of the various educational policies are put together and made coherent.

Recently our reforms have been faltering. We ran out of money, like a lot of other States. And moreover, we began to suffer grave problems with something I want to stress and come back to in the Federal role.

A lot of the discussion today has been about policies and laws and high level stuff. The game of education is won or lost in the classroom where teachers meet children. California found that we had these very high level standards and textbooks and assessments, but we did not have the teachers that could convey and teach this complex challenging curriculum to a very diverse student body, 55 percent of whom are various minorities in the State.

So, when we looked at the actual classroom implementation, the teachers either weren't prepared in teacher training for this, and the teacher training is not well aligned with our curriculum—it is largely done by independent universities—nor did we have staff de-

velopment programs that enabled the teachers to teach this. Usually staff development is one shot; brief, 2-day; tired time for the teacher; no coaching, no follow-up; and very little happens. So, when you got to the classrooms, teachers in our mathematics curriculum were using manipulatives for mathematics but didn't quite know exactly how to hook them to the concepts.

Now, the Federal structure is not well—was never crafted to reinforce high level curriculum change. It was set up, as we called it in the 1960s, under “picket fence” federalism: Take a problem, set up a picket, and create a categorical program for it, and largely run the Federal categorical programs alongside but not part of the general curriculum. Federal policy did not address directly history and math and social studies and science and foreign language. It was concerned with ensuring policies and programs that were more or less separated out from the core curriculums. Special programs for the disadvantaged, often “pull-out” programs, bilingual programs, special education programs, vocational education programs. So when you took the Federal programs and you said, Now, let's try and use these, they were sort of off on the side. We sort of proceeded with our reforms and tried to bend the Federal categorical structure into it, but it was never really designed for this.

Now part of the Federal structure inhibits what you are trying to do. The changes made in Chapter 1, called program improvement, require California and other States to use what are called national testing, national NCE equivalents. They are national testing STANINE equivalents on standardized national tests. Most of these tests, virtually all of them used by Federal Chapter 1 are not aligned and not coherent with the California curricular frameworks. The federally pushed tests are low level, low skills—we call them “drill and kill”—featuring worksheets, multiple choice answers, a curriculum—and the answers and what you are supposed to teach for Chapter 1 program improvement are the old-fashioned, lower levels basic skills curriculum, not synthesis analysis, problem-solving, probability and statistics in math, for example. You can't get statistics and probability till you go to college for some reason in America.

So there are parts of the program that actually—of the Federal programs that actually conflict with what we are trying to do. Now, I think then that we need a basic shift in the Federal orientation and the Federal role, and on page 10 of my statement I have made several specific comments. Number one, adopt the recommendations of the Independent Review Panel on Chapter 1, which I am a member of, and the Commission on Chapter 1. These recommendations are designed to meet major California problems with Chapter 1, and will help align Federal policies with California's academic standards and curricular frameworks. Commission recommendations on Title 1, for example, would focus on the school as the unit of change and free Chapter 1 from orientation to low level basis skills and flawed program improvement strategies.

From California's standpoint, we would need an annual updating of the Decennial Census so that the Chapter 1 formula is based on California's current school population. We grow at approximately 200,000 pupils a year. It varies, but we create a new elementary

school with 650 pupils every day out there in terms of its growth, and Federal formulas don't reflect that.

Second, and this is back to my theme of the game is won or lost in the classroom—expand and enable more Federal funds to be used for staff development and preservice teacher preparation that is oriented with the concepts of high standards and high outcomes in the California curricular frameworks.

For example, we had in the 1960s a program called the Education Professions Development Act. It was abolished—it was a Federal program—under the view that we no longer had a teaching shortage. Well, it is not clear we have a teaching shortage now, but we do need—in many areas we don't, but in some areas we do. But we do need much more help in preservice training of teachers and staff development. That could also be done, but I think the consolidation recommendations that you heard from Tom Boysen that the Chief State School Officers encourage.

Next, I would overhaul the Federal Eisenhower math and science development programs. Most of those programs come in, are allocated to local schools and they are done—they provide very short-term staff development for teachers. It is the right idea. It is the wrong concept. It is too brief, too shallow. For teachers to really teach some new things, need somebody to coach and follow-up. You just don't go out and do something after a 2-day workshop. So I would say that that needs to be reoriented and made much more indepth, and again align with the curricular frameworks and changes we are trying to make.

Fourth, we would recommend—third, rather—that we expand Chapter 2 and provide more focus for it in developing statewide assessment features. Most of the States are desperately trying to reorient their assessment systems to higher order skills and frameworks.

Fourth, pass legislation similar to S. 2 or H.R. 4323, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, that died in the last Congress. I would say that that program needs to more closely track a good design program that the National Science Foundation runs called State Systemic Reform where they have a program and an approach that tries to tie the Federal funds to the State's improvements in curriculum, testing, textbooks, staff development.

Fifth, expand Federal bilingual assistance, especially to States like California with huge influences of immigrants and of students who are of limited English-speaking.

In sum, then, Federal policy needs to be made more coherent and focused on a few policy objectives, rather than scattered among a historical collection of unrelated categories. Federal policy would be more effective that reinforce State and local reforms, rather than trying to be a categorical deliverer on the outside of those reforms. State reform cannot succeed without support and commitment from both the Federal and local level.

What I am recommending then is something between the old process of putting the money on the—Federal money on the stump and running and the current thing, which is to send the money down to us in 35 to 40 rather unrelated and rather out-of-date categorical conceptions. We need then to tie the Federal role to high

curricular standards, staff development, high pupil assessment, and I think the processes and concepts used in the National goals.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Dr. Kirst.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kirst follows:]

California Education Reforms: Implications For  
Federal Policy

Testimony of Michael W. Kirst, to the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor, February 2, 1993. Research for this testimony was supported by the Center for Policy Research in Education and Policy Analysis for California Education.\*

1993 marks the tenth anniversary of the educational "call to arms," A Nation At Risk (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). It also marks the tenth anniversary of education under California State Superintendent of Schools Bill Honig and the passage of Senate Bill 813, California's wide-reaching omnibus educational reform act. While the passage of SB813 occurred independent of, not in response to, the recommendations outlined in A Nation At Risk, it certainly reflected a concurrent statewide concern over the state of public education in California, and expressed the public's willingness to significantly change the direction and leadership for public education.

A summary of the major 1983-1986 reforms are as follows:

- 0 Increased High School Graduation, California State University, and University of California University Entrance Requirements
- 0 Model Curriculum Standards for grades nine through twelve
- 0 Changes in Textbooks and Textbook adoption procedures
- 0 Improved and Expanded Assessment Program (CAP)
- 0 Mentor Teacher Program
- 0 Certification of Teacher Evaluators, Alternative

\*The writer acknowledges the assistance of Gary Yee on the California reform analysis.

# Certification, and New Teacher Evaluation Systems

- 0 Local Staff Development for Teachers and Administrators
- 0 School Improvement Program (SIP)
- 0 Increases in Homework and Writing
- 0 Tenth Grade Counseling
- 0 Longer School Day and Longer School Year
- 0 Establishment of Quality Indicators
- 0 A Regents-type Golden State Examination
- 0 Increased Accountability

The California educational reform program was cited as a model reform package; it committed significant new monies, provided incentives for adoption, worked to upgrade the caliber of the teaching profession, established a clear new direction, and upgraded the accountability system. The three major components of school reform, curriculum and instruction, assessment and accountability, and capacity building, are generally covered by SB813.

It appears that the initial focus of SB813 was on developing "world class" academic standards at the high school: rethinking the content of all major curricular frameworks including math, science, social studies, art and language arts; increasing counseling services; adding class periods, increasing the graduation requirements, increasing the rigor and content of classes, developing model curriculum standards, especially related to college preparation and entrance. Some of the reforms which required relatively minor structural changes, were quickly adopted by local districts, such as increased graduation

requirements, and those for which the state had provided additional funding, such as an extended school year, increased counseling, and the addition of class periods. Indicators of success included increased students in Advanced Placement, reduced dropout rates, higher attendance, and increased enrollment in academic courses. However, it became apparent that, for the changes at the high school to be truly effective, prior changes in the middle and elementary schools were required. State task forces addressed each of these levels during the decade, but no major state-funded initiatives ensued.

While policy makers hoped for a fundamental shift in educational direction, the reforms most readily adopted at the local level were those which had "tweaked" the system. They required little significant change in district structure, culture, or required minimal negotiation with teacher unions. These reforms improved the efficiency and effectiveness of the established system without requiring substantial structural change. A path toward structural reform changes such as school governance was not really clearly articulated in SB 813 in 1983, but evolved as some schools attempted to implement the recommendations outlined in the curricular frameworks. They found that organizational structures and norms impeded efforts to implement the dramatic instructional shifts outlined in the frameworks. For example, science required more than 45 minute class periods.

What began to emerge as a primary policy instrument is the



state curriculum frameworks. They provided a way to standardize curriculum and instruction in each subject area. They are designed to provide content continuity and articulation through the grades and identify appropriate instructional strategies. Content frameworks continue to be developed, one discipline per year, by a combination of classroom teachers and administrators, district curriculum developers, and disciplinary experts from universities. The influence of professional discipline-based organizations such as NCTM, NSTA, is important: their reports, and leaders from their ranks, as well as university researchers, formed the substantive base for most of the development. Publishers struggled to find ways to incorporate the content, philosophy and strategies into the traditional textbook. Frameworks are not state-mandated for local use, but their link to the state-funded textbook adoption process and the state-mandated assessment program creates strong incentives for local use. Moreover, many local educational agencies (LEA) believe the state frameworks embody improved curricular concepts and much higher academic standards.

For grades kindergarten through eight, textbook monies from the state were available, but they could largely be spent only on state-adopted textbooks, and the adoption process required state-adopted textbook content to reflect the state frameworks. Frameworks became a way to evaluate the content of textbooks, beyond simply the checking the readability level and the ethnic balance. As a result, the frameworks seem to have had the most

immediate effect on elementary schools across the state through the textbook adoption process and the accompanying staff development provided both by publishers and the state.

In 1988, through the passage of SB 1882, California created some innovative and effective staff development approaches including six-week summer institutes and local teacher networks. But these are not widespread and effect few teachers. The concepts in the state curricular frameworks are beginning to seep into university teacher preparation.

School districts and county offices, with the primary responsibility to provide sufficient staff development, are usually not able to provide sustained support for classroom teachers. More attention needs to be directed toward reform issues involving the quality of teachers and the quality of the teaching environment, the so-called "second wave" of reform. In 1988, SB 1882 re-designed the whole area of staff development, and funded a three-tiered staff development strategy, which shifted away from multiple categorical support for local district staff development (often in the form of Mentor Teacher Support, and the mini-grant project program, CTIIP) toward university-supported teacher networks, such as California Science Information Network (CSIN), the California History Project (CHP), the California Math Project (CMP), the New Teacher Support Network, etc. These teacher networks focused on site-based teams of teachers who became curriculum experts; they would return to their sites after state institutes with both curriculum and

school change skills. It depends on the dissemination of skills and information by this small percentage of trained teachers, and it is not yet clear whether this will occur.

The California reform agenda evolved during the eighties from a push to improve academic standards to more coordinated "systemic" reform. The state's academic content coordination of curriculum frameworks, CAP assessment, textbook revisions, tiered staff development, and restructured governance has been touted as a precursor to state "systemic" reform. State systemic reform has several components: one is the development of integrated strategies working towards a single set of goals. A second is the pairing of state policies on the "what" should be taught, with flexible local implementation strategies on how to teach high academic standards. There has been a high degree of integration among the curriculum, textbook adoption, and assessment aspects of the state reform package to date. Initially, the SB813 reforms of 1983 had a comprehensive, but non-integrated feel; this was because the frameworks, the CAP test, and the textbooks were as yet undeveloped. After five years, the frameworks became the primary document to which the other policy instruments were linked. They describe what should be taught and how for each discipline. Textbooks up to the eighth grade must conform to standards outlined in the frameworks and the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, if the state pays for them. The CAP program has evolved into a sophisticated, performance-based assessment

program which will reflect the framework standards using authentic assessment. The state-specified Program Quality Review assessment of schools uses quality indicators that are derived from the state curriculum frameworks.

But the nineties brought a series of jolts that have diverted some of the initial state energy and influence for systemic reform. Despite an initial euphoria over the apparent agreement between the State Superintendent Honig and newly elected, pro-education Governor Pete Wilson over the educational agenda, a rift has developed over the direction of that agenda, and the amount of funding that will be attached to it.

Second, as a result of state aid cuts many districts experienced a severe budget shortfall. California is in a recession, and the district budgets are squeezed with few resources for reform initiatives.

Third, the California pupil population grows at an annual rate in excess of 200,000 students; this is the equivalent of one new school with 23 teachers per day. State and local funding per ADA has been declining since 1990, so state resources are stretched to the limit, let alone able to fund significant state-wide reform, especially high-cost items such as capital improvements, technology, lower class size, and staff development.

#### Rethinking Federal Policy to Help California

Federal education policy is a melange of categorical programs, some of which reinforce and help California's education

reform, and others are irrelevant or hinder it. At the heart of California's reforms are pupil outcomes embodied in curricular frameworks. Many of these curricular frameworks are cited as national models for what pupils need to know and be able to do in science, math, etc. The national educational goals are congruent with California's education reforms. The problem is that federal policy is incoherent, and crucial federal components conflict with California reform.

For example, Chapter I program improvement features nationally standardized tests that are not compatible with California curricular frameworks, textbooks, or new assessments. Chapter I mandates an older system of low level skills, "drill and kill worksheets," and multiple choice tests. Consequently, California schools that do well on implementing California curricular reforms will not stress the content or teaching methods implied in Chapter I national tests. In math, California wants to emphasize probability and statistics, but these are not stressed by Chapter I tests.

The other major federal programs were never designed to reinforce the California reforms. Special education is not focussed on pupil outcomes, but has many input and procedural mandates. Vocational education is more flexible, but it also has not featured math and science as part of vocational education the way California desires. Chapter 2 is not curricular or pupil outcome focussed, but can play a helpful role. Federal aid could help with California's major need of building teacher capacity to

teach the complex and demanding California frameworks, but there are no large U.S. Education Department programs that focus on this crucial component. Most Eisenhower Math/Science money is sent by federal formulas to local districts who may or may not use it to help teachers implement California curricular frameworks. Federal bilingual education is so small that it hardly causes a ripple in California where over 1.2 million children are limited or non English speaking.

California would benefit substantially from the bills in the 102 Congress (S2 and HR 4323) that stress systemic reform. California has an overall state policy vision that includes the key elements of systemic reform, but many of these elements are only partially implemented. California's conceptualization of the entire systemic process is sound and exemplary. But the implementation has faltered because of insufficient political consensus and a consequent lack of resources. This shortfall is particularly acute with respect to staff development and preservice teacher education. New Federal aid in S2 or HR 3320 could, at least partially, fill these gaps. Investment to help the teachers who want to teach the new state frameworks is woefully inadequate, and time and resources need to be invested in university skeptical teachers.

Nevertheless, California is "inching forward" and making progress on systemic reform. The curriculum frameworks drive the education dialogue in the state. The recession has slowed but not stopped the reform.

Federal Policy Recommendations

A more coherent federal policy focussed on high academic standards and pupil outcomes is needed to help California.

Specifically,

- 1) Adopt the recommendation of the Independent Review Panel on Chapter I and the Commission on Chapter I. These recommendations are designed to meet major California problems with Chapter I, and will help align federal policies with California's high academic standards, curriculum frameworks, pupil assessments, and teacher preparation. Commission recommendations would focus on schools as a unit of change, and untie Chapter I from low level basic skills tests and flawed program improvement strategies.
- 2) Enable more federal funds to be used for staff development and pre-service teacher preparation that is aligned with the concepts in the California curricular frameworks. This policy also would reinforce the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and other national curricular standards group. The Federal Government should establish a teacher development effort like the Education Professions Development Act of the 1960's, but focus it on world class academic standards. The federal government should encourage Eisenhower math/science staff development grants to be aligned with the state systemic curricular reforms. Many districts get very small amounts of Eisenhower money. These grants should be combined and focussed on multi-week and intensive staff development activities, that result in local teacher networks to provide follow-up coaching

and reinforcement during classroom implementation.

3) Expand Chapter 2 so that California would have more funds to develop its new statewide assessment system that features performance and portfolio concepts.

4) Pass legislation similar to S2 or HR 4323 (The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act) of the 102 Congress. Use the version that died in September 1992 as a basis for revisions and updates. Make HR 4323 more closely resemble the systemic state initiative concepts used by NSF. This initiative relates and links all state policies to revisions in curriculum and high academic content standards.

5) Expand federal bilingual assistance especially to states like California with large influxes of immigrants.

In sum, federal policy needs to be made more coherent and focussed on a few policy objectives rather than scattered among a historical collection of unrelated categories. Since the states provide about 50% of all school funding (and the federal government 6%), federal policy would be more effective if it reinforced state and local reform policies. State reform cannot succeed without support and commitment from both the federal and local level. Federal support should be more oriented to building local capacity to improve pupil outcomes that are embodied in California curriculum frameworks.



Chairman KILDEE. Before we begin the questioning, I would like to call attention to the fact that another member of the committee, a new member, Ted Strickland, has joined us.

And a good friend of this committee, a good friend of education, Ron Mazzoli, would like to make a comment.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your indulgence. I just really wished to come this morning, having just returned from the Commonwealth of Kentucky by plane, to welcome Dr. Boysen and his panelists. But particularly Dr. Boysen, who is the superintendent of our entire State school system, and who has spearheaded the implementation of what we call KERA, Mr. Chairman, which is the Educational Reform Act, which for the first time in my experience as a native-born Kentuckian has really catapulted our Commonwealth to the forefront of the Nation's 50 States in seeking to find a better way to educate our children.

So I just want to salute the doctor for what he has done and thank you for including Dr. Boysen as a member of the educational team that is leading Kentucky into a new era. So we want to thank you.

And welcome, Tom, and good luck to you and to your fellow panelists.

Commissioner BOYSEN. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you.

Also joining us is Congressman Boehner and Congressman McKeon.

I would like to start out the questions, probably with Dr. Boysen first. Could you tell us how your proposal for greater flexibility would work? That is, you indicated we could keep the categorical on the Federal level but allow the States and localities to cluster. Could you give us an example of what programs might reasonably or logically be clustered?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Yes, I can, Chairman Kildee. And the essence of my testimony really is that Federal programs need to concentrate less on the dough and more on the yeast—more on the change in the leverage—and in order to do that we need to get the various pieces of the dough in one place. Let's consider, for example, Chapter 1, bilingual education, migrant and homeless education, and we have those situations in Louisville, we had them in San Diego, where there are children like that in the school. And when you have those three programs you develop 12 possibilities, someone who is in two of them but not the third one, someone who is only one. So you get a blizzard of complexity at the school level, and the learning goals are lost there.

So there is a need to hold the school accountable for the performance of all those children, but not to smother it with all of the guidelines that cause this aide can't deal with that child but he or she can deal with that one.

So the idea is to cause the school to develop a plan for improvement which is going to be looking at the essence of the school as well as the add-ons and hold the school accountable for it. The money and the monitoring from the Federal Government would still be driven by the formulas that deal with a number of schools of these kinds. The accountability would still be broken out for stu-

dents of the school as a whole and for each subset of students. In that way you could get the school being able to look at all of its resources at one time and still know that it had accountability, down the line it was going to have to answer for how each one of those children performed.

Chairman KILDEE. If, for example, a student would—I will use the term generate X number of dollars because they qualify for Chapter 1, X number of dollars because they qualify for another program, X number of dollars because they qualify for bilingual, would you want to intermingle those dollars a bit for those students generating those dollars, or would you go to greater flexibility and even mix some of the students who might not be generating those dollars?

Commissioner BOYSEN. As you said, they would be generated by the needs of the children in the schools. But the program would not look at accountability. It would not look at where those dollars went in the school, it would look at what happened to those students. Because the more focus you put on following those programs up categorically, the more you intrude into the life of the school. And you might say that right now our effort is sort of like putting outboard motors on barges: they are not moving very much. We have to get into the essence of that program, of that other 94 percent of the money, and make that powerful for all the children in the school.

And yet a danger there that I know would worry you as it worries me is that we lose focus and concentration on those special needs children. I think that going in knowing that there is a strong assessment system that is measuring the right things, that the result is going to be reported out by subsets of children in the school, that the school is going to be held accountable—all of those things will cause the people creatively to use the resources.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Woodside, you mentioned that very often we categorize children with categorical programs. I think we somewhat do that even on the Federal level. This full Committee of Education and Labor encompasses, at least that comes quickly to mind, four different Cabinet departments: Education, Labor, HHS and Agriculture, and at least three of those do touch immediately upon the needs of that student walking through the front door of that school. Perhaps we can do even a better job on the Federal level of some coordination between Agriculture and HHS and the Department of Education.

That used to frustrate me several years ago. I one time out of frustration and certain hyperbole suggested that they get one phone line between HHS and the Department of Education. That was several years ago.

Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. WOODSIDE. Well, I—you know, some wag in Washington some years ago defined collaboration as an unnatural act between two non-consenting adults, and I think that is the way it has been looked at. There are too many turf issues, too many—just too many stumbling blocks to get that going. On the other hand, I am convinced after what has happened successfully at local levels the one thing that is absolutely clear is that collaboration is imperative if you are going to have any kind of success, and we are all working

to combine all of these things at the district level with all kinds of experiments at the whole school level—I am now thinking of New York, which is a complex monster in its own right—and at the State level.

So I think whether it is an unnatural act or not it is going to be a fact of life if we are really going to handle reform in any kind of meaningful way. And I must say I was impressed a couple of years ago, Lawton Chiles and I decided, he as head of the National Commission on Infant Mortality and myself as head of the Institute for Educational Leadership, that we had to combine those two and get a program going called the Health/Education Consortium. I was very much concerned that it would be another one of these useless kinds of get-togethers where we would produce a handful of very intelligent, perceptive papers and walk away and say, Well, we have done that and congratulations to us, and that would be the end.

It was not the end. It has really mushroomed dramatically. It is very successful at local levels. For the first time, doctors seemed to feel some sense of obligation to what is going on in the school population, and we have probably at this point 200 or 300 programs at the local level where we are attempting to mesh health and education. We have got a long way to go but we are making the first steps.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. If we were to grant this greater flexibility in the school so they could commingle and creatively use these funds, would site-based management assist in doing just that? Should that decision be made at the school level to some extent?

Commissioner BOYSEN. I think it should be made almost exclusively at the school level, and having the players at the table, parents, teachers, the principal, and others, is very important. That they know going in they have the accountability, they have the running room. Use these resources. Focus on those children. Get the job done.

Chairman KILDEE. So they would know that so many Federal dollars had been generated by that school population there for various programs, and give them some flexibility as to how to, on a school-wide basis, use those dollars?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Yes. And we have, sir, in the Extended School Services program, which is another feature of the Reform Act, and just to give you a scope, the reform initiatives such as pre-school/extended school services, professional development, testing, and so forth, together amount to about \$108 million a year. We have a \$3 billion a year education budget in Kentucky.

The collection of all the Hawkins-Stafford programs in Kentucky is \$137 million. So we are having a huge impact over here with 108 and we need to have more of that same kind of impact with this \$137 million. The Extended School Services program in Kentucky is for children at risk of school failure. It is \$33 million that is given out to districts, and most of it is school based. We do very little monitoring of the way that it is spent. But the school knows that it is going to be held accountable in a very significant way in 1994 for the gains of all the children in the school, especially those with educational challenges.

Chairman KILDEE. Dr. Kirst, what should the role of schools of education be in school reform, and how can the Federal Government assist the schools of education in playing a meaningful role?

Mr. KIRST. Well, I think the prime role of schools of education is to produce the people who will be working in the schools, the professionals at the level of teachers and administrations, and that sort of area. I think that a lot of the education and school programs are not at this point terribly effective, and therefore just, you know, block grants or something, the schools of education would make me very nervous in terms of changing things around. So I think what we need to do when we—again studying California, we just did a study out there of whether the teacher preparation programs are oriented around the high level curricular frameworks we are trying to teach, and you find that a lot of the preparation of the teachers is towards the older curriculum, not the newer curriculum that we are all trying to push for across the country.

So I would really provide assistance to schools of education only if they were part of a theme that we have been striking here, that their efforts are tied in systemically to what State and Federal policy is, meaning in the student outcomes, in the new conceptions of curriculum, new conceptions of new assessment. So it should be money for change in their programs which are also aligned with what States and Federal goals are for education.

Chairman KILDEE. I am going to stop now and go on to the next member—I think Mr. Cunningham will be next. But first, could there be better connections between schools of education and the elementary and secondary schools out there in the field? What I have in mind is placement like internships of students during their active years of education, other than just for practice teaching, and also your own professors so they are seeing what is really taking place in the local schools. Could there be better interaction between the schools of education and the K-12 schools?

Mr. KIRST. Yes, and this is an area where I think we need a lot of work. We have the concepts across the country of professional development schools, where professors from the schools of education are actually teaching in the schools and demonstrating to the newer teachers how they ought to be teaching themselves.

And secondly, we have programs, including in California, called the Beginning Teacher Education program. Teachers tend to teach for a long time in their career the way they initially start teaching in their first year or so, and so anything that would strengthen that link would be important. We need to, then, have close collaboration between the universities and the schools and make sure that the people in the schools that are inducting the new teachers are really trying to and understand what, for example, we are trying to do now in mathematics and science and other fields, so that they are not just inducting them in the old ways of doing business, but in the new ways of doing business.

I think it is very hard to write a Federal statute to actually carry all this out, and that was the old style of things. We tried to sit up here and write a law and, you know, spell out how the Federal funds would be spent by the ed schools and by the universities. And I think what we are saying here on this panel is that you are going to have to have some general standards of outcomes you

want, provide some money to these institutions, and then hold them accountable for these outcomes, which is very different than worrying about the processes and what they actually spent the money on. It is more how they are linked to other policies, so how does what your money is spent, how does it link and reinforce other policies, and then what are the outcomes you are looking for in terms of teachers? So you would want to, for example, support the concepts of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

I mean the real hope I have for schools of education and the rest of this process is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which does provide some—does get some Federal money, which is an entirely new vision of what teachers ought to know and be able to do, and will certify teachers nationally in this country in 1994. It is a voluntary private organization, and it will have a tremendous impact, I think, in the future.

Chairman KILDEE. Just one final question. It was just triggered from your statement there.

For the last 3 or 4 years this subcommittee has been hearing outcomes and I think we all buy into that. Could you prioritize what are the outcomes we should be looking for or seeking in K-12 education. Where are we? Where are our greatest deficiencies? Where should we be putting in the sandbags and building it up again? Could you prioritize in some way, any one of you three, some of the outcomes?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Well, I—by the way, I inherited the Kentucky Education Reform Act. So, as much as I take pride in it, I don't take credit for it.

It does begin with six goals, which if you look at the goals over the years of education, they are very much the same: ten imperative needs, seven cardinal principles. They touch the same ground. Goal number one is basic math and communication skills, and, as Mike has been pointing out, we need to move to the higher order level; for example, the probability and statistics for every high school student.

Number two is core concepts in academic areas.

Number three is healthy group membership.

Number four is personal self-sufficiency.

Number five is problem solving.

And number six is the integration of knowledge across disciplines, so people can do something with what they know.

So, in my opinion, there is a tremendous amount of consensus about what the goals are, and when you go into the standard-setting work, for example, the National Council of Teachers of Math, a consensus is arrived at reasonably easily about what the standards should be. And where the focus has to go now is to the assessments.

When I was teaching in Africa, my students were high school young men who came in wearing their first pairs of shoes, many of them. Their fees, as minimal as they were, were gathered from their clansmen. In 4 years those students had to pass the Cambridge School Certificate Examination that was literally mailed out to us from England, mailed back, and scored there. And it was that

really strong focus on results that gave life to the standards, that brought them into the classroom, that made the difference.

Mr. KIRST. I think that when you look at our assessments, and we have some good data in the National Assessment of Educational Progress, our problem is not with so much the basic skills, and let me redefine that in a specific way.

A majority of American pupils can take a math problem that they have seen six times and solve the seventh one. It is just like the sixth one. But, if they are asked to solve a problem they haven't seen before that calls for using several concepts and combining them, they have problems. They have difficulty with that. That is under the rubric of mathematical problem-solving.

They know very little about probability and statistics. So we are taught algebra and geometry, but a lot of what business and industry wants, for example, is making inferences from looking at tables and charts of data. Not much of that is taught. That is another reason we look terrible in international competitions, because the international arena teaches that more.

In science, our science textbooks, for example, in most places in 10 through 12 are boring memorization glossary of terms. It is like reading a dictionary, and you remember these things over and over again. They don't know that much about how to solve scientific problems, apply scientific concepts.

In writing, they can write short paragraphs, but they can't write a long thing like, say, argue a point of view even similar to, say, a newspaper editorial. And in reading, they can read fairly well short simple passages. It is when you get into complex reading, the tone and mood of the author, getting behind it, that they have difficulty.

All of this we are trying to push forward. And, what you want to be sure in the Federal Government is that you are not pushing tests that test low-level basic skills and that inhibit States that are reaching higher. So, to me, you want to say, What are the outcomes we want for pupils, and then how can we align the Federal aid system to lead to that?

But you do have to have accountability. You know, just freeing up flexibility. For example, a lot of the Chapter 1 schoolwide projects to me are not that impressive. They are class size reduction. They are not really oriented that much to these pupil outcomes. So you have to find some blend between money on the stump and overcategorization and regulation.

Chairman KILDIE. Any other comment?

[No response.]

Chairman KILGEE. I really appreciate the subcommittee indulging the Chairman in taking more time than what is usually allotted to anyone.

Now, I will call upon Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You take as much time as you want.

Chairman KILGEE. Thank you.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to thank the distinguished gentlemen for their testimony this morning.

Dr. Boysen, I have a particular interest in what you were talking about, in combining the funds. My wife has her doctorate degree in

education and is a principal in the Encinitas School System. I was a high school teacher and a coach, before I went into the service and later, a dean of a college in San Diego.

California has undergone an enormous influx in population, which Dr. Kirst is well aware of. Our Chapter 1 funds were based on the 1980 census, and we are not getting our fair share. I make it a point to travel once a month in the different school districts and watch what is going on. I find that each school's funding requirements are quite different, even within my own district. For example, the Paul Ecke School has about 40 percent of all the bilingual education, and they do a very good job. Dr. Kirst, I invite you to come down and take a look.

But my question would be who would monitor the development? We just had our State superintendent found guilty of diverting \$300,000 into his wife's account this past week. And when we are talking about dollars going in and combining them, although you could do it on a local school level, would it be the school superintendent within the district that would make sure that the proper development is going on?

Commissioner BOYSEN. There would be in my opinion two kinds of monitoring. One of them would be the monitoring of those very children who are in that school, the 40 percent of them, and how they are proceeding from year to year. And there would be a State assessment system like the California assessment program, but hopefully more performance based, that would produce information for all the parents in the school. Because I agree with the point that you were making, Mr. Woodside, that the level of satisfaction is too high among parents for their children's education. One thing we have achieved in Kentucky by revealing that 90 percent of them they don't meet the standard is we have created some constructive dissatisfaction which is now focused on the school councils that are running those schools. So there has to be a really good, substantial State-level assessment program. It could be done district by district, but I think it makes so much more sense to do it in the State, and those results are the basis upon which the State holds them accountable.

The Federal Government has in the National Assessment of Educational Progress, for example, a way of independently evaluating how students in this category are doing. So I think there would be a mixed system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think that is how I would like to see it, and the fact that you could tie in different States, especially those that are impacted by immigration like California, Arizona, Texas, Florida, and so on.

Dr. Kirst, I would like to invite you to come down to San Diego. I think we have got a very good system down there. Another thing they do is have classes for parents in the evening. It has a great impact on those who don't speak English.

And for Dr. Woodside, they combine not only education but they include health and HHS matters for those folks as well.

I would like the members to know that this Republican member is considered a hawk and a conservative, but in the field of education I am considered a moderate to a liberal, and I like that designation. You will find me to be very supportive.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Now, the Chair is going to try to call upon members in the order in which they arrived at the committee. I recognize there was some mobility, so I will try to adjust for that.

But, Mr. Roemer?

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to thank the panel for great testimony, very innovative testimony. I hope that sometime I can continue to follow up. I have lots of questions, but I know my light is already on here.

First of all, let me begin, Tom, with you in terms of learning a little bit more about the Family Resources and Health Services Centers that you talked about. You said they are located near about 414 schools and you just briefly referred to one of the areas where they are located having 20 percent or more economically deprived students. What other considerations that go into where you locate these centers? How do you share costs? Are there flexibilities involved in sharing the costs here outside of the education budget? Do you get help from, perhaps, any State sources or medic-aid or medicare? Or are these the kind of waivers in flexibility that you are talking about?

And lastly, how are services integrated with those existing services that are already in place? How do you deliver those services to these kids to make sure that learning isn't secondary, that their health is there?

Commissioner BOYSEN. This is a good example of a yeast program. It is \$15 million that is given out competitively in grants to the schools that are eligible and compete successfully to get it. It started with, I think, 130 and the second wave has 222. I think we are going to have 350 next year. Actually, 1,000 of the 1,400 schools in the Commonwealth would be eligible for this.

Most of the centers are in school. They serve that school and usually one other school. And I use the air traffic controller analogy because here is a person who is hired by the school, the grant is to the school district, although interestingly the cabinet for human resources is the State level administrator, it is not the Kentucky Department of Education, and that has had many, many values to it because they are the people who know what the services are that need to be linked together and they view it too as an early warning alert to them on how complex and inaccessible they are getting because these 222 coordinators are out there giving them feedback.

So they access various services. It is unusual to have the Public Health Service actually place a nurse in a school because the concentration of students there is usually not high enough to warrant it. But they will schedule themselves into the school to give the immunizations, the physicals, the things that the children there need.

Increasingly we are getting enough business so that medicaid funds can be used to support a service that is either resident in the school or comes and spends a period of time there. So what I see it doing, while I see in many other States this sort of dialogue going on among the large social service agencies and education at the State level, Kentucky came and just put down these coordinators, and they are not waiting for the system to get any simpler. They just have people out there who are, by the way, hired by a council



of parents from the school and the principal, and they are all over the spectrum as far as having been social workers and educators, or many of them just savvy parents who know the networks.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you. Again, this is one area where I would like to follow-up with you on a couple of questions as well too.

Dr. KIRST, let me say too that I found your testimony very interesting in terms of your emphasis on staff development and in-service teacher training programs. To use the analogy for me, with the University of Notre Dame in my district, it would be like telling the University of Notre Dame football team that they are going to do a brand-new type of forward pass and an offense and then not let the team practice at all, just tell them to do this in the Southern Cal game. That is what we are telling our teachers to do in many instances. No practice time. No exposure to new technology. No sharing of new ideas. You just have to memorize or learn this new curriculum and teach it right away.

Teacher training is the first thing cut from our State budgets. California with a \$10 billion deficit right now I am sure is experiencing some of these same things. How do we get around this? How do we begin, not just as Tom said in his testimony—he called for a supplemental appropriation for Title 5 of the Higher Education Act. What can our universities and our businesses do, Mr. Woodside, after Dr. Kirst answers this, to help us with this in-service problem so that we are not testing our students for low skill requirements, but we are motivating them into the new problem-solving techniques and the analysis techniques? What kinds of cooperation can we see at the local level to emphasize this?

And then finally, how do we reorganize this Elementary/Secondary Act? Do we do it as Tom and you have suggested, creating a new title? I think you have titled it Title 4 of the Act for in-service training programs and new research in this area. Help us with some answers here, if you could.

Mr. KIRST. Okay. I think, first of all, the committee needs to think about the interactions between what it is doing in the Higher Education Act where teacher training is considered and is part of higher education and the elementary/secondary field. That has been the problem I pointed out in California, where you have one set of committees off on higher education and they don't really relate their program very closely to what we are doing on elementary/secondary. So I think thinking about the two and how you want to link the two is very important, just in terms of committee business and structure.

I think here is where you want to hold out some fairly clear standards that you want for the training. Not telling them in detail how to do it, but fairly clear standards on some of the areas that they must address. As you indicated, the key to a lot of successful implementation of new techniques and new curriculum is whether there is some follow-up in coaching, in networks of teachers that help each other, troubleshooters to come in, and generally a follow-up procedure. Most of the staff development we observed in California was you do it and then—as you indicated, just do it and there is no follow-up.

So I think you want to have standards for follow-up for teachers being able to get help as they actually get out there in the classroom and try and work on this.

The second point I would completely agree with you is that staff development and the improvement of the teachers is regarded as a frill. It is cut very early. It was cut fast in California, so that while we kept developing high level curriculum and ever better assessments, who was going to teach this was left to, you know, who—so that you do need, I think, as is indicated here in the Chief State School Officers' recommendations, some kind of focus that will have—make sure that the staff development is there.

Now, the Commission on Chapter 1 recommends also that a certain amount of Chapter 1 funds be earmarked for staff development. My view is if you took the restrictions off of Chapter 1 and you did all this fancy consolidation nothing would happen at the classroom level. They would just keep doing what they are doing. And the coordinators that coordinate Chapter 1 would keep coordinating the way they have coordinated.

So you need more than just deregulation and expecting 1,000 flowers to bloom. It has got to come in terms of this staff development, and I would say that is a good recommendation in terms of a focused policy for staff development there.

After watching Stanford versus Notre Dame, they do need some follow-up.

[Laughter.]

Mr. ROEMER. We will get you again.

Our one loss all year, Mr. Chairman, and we took it from his school. They played a great game too.

Mr. WOODSIDE. I suppose I can argue a little bit by analogy. I am not as close as Mike is or Tom is to what is precisely going on or how it would be managed. But U.S. industry is, obviously, restructuring itself and trying to adapt belatedly to a changing world, and the managers that are now running those corporations have never been trained in any way to run the corporation the way it has to be run from this point forward. The only way that we have been able to figure out how to do it in industry is to in a sense teach in each corporation a whole new way of looking at the way that corporation performs. And I think if we are really going to make headway in getting these kinds of improved teachers on site where it counts, we are going to have to do that school by school through some kind of grant focused directly on retraining of teachers.

We are facing the collapse of a system that started shortly after World War II. Part of this is a teacher quality issue, and when women after World War II had options other than being a school-teacher or a nurse, the school boards refused to up the salaries to be competitive in any way. And so for years, with the single exception of the Vietnam War period, we were selecting as teachers the body 20 percent of third tier colleges and universities. Now, this is not to say that there aren't dedicated, intelligent teachers in the system. But we have done everything in our power to undercut the talents that are there to teach people. We have, in a sense, tried to correct for that by increasing the compensation of teachers as a profession dramatically over the last 5 years. I would say on the

average teachers' salaries have gone up over 50 percent over that period.

Long term I don't know how you handle the issue of bureaucracy. We have had a homes group for years and years trying to match standards for teachers' colleges, if you will, or those parts of public universities that were originally teachers' colleges, and we find that while bureaucracy is a major problem in corporations, and I am sure in all governmental bodies, I have never seen anything that can quite match the academic bureaucracy and its ability to stultify and stop change, and I really don't know how we are going to handle that. I have watched it in New York City where the whole thing collapsed because of academic opposition to a changed curriculum, and that is going to be a long-term problem for us to begin to create incoming teachers that are prepared to teach the kind of curriculum Tom and Mike are talking about, and I don't know how we are going to do that.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. And I would just like to recommend that we don't invite Dr. Kirst back until Notre Dame beats Stanford.

[Laughter.]

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Gunderson? Mr. McKeon?

Mr. McKEON. The first process is learning how to turn on the microphone.

[Laughter.]

Mr. McKEON. Now, to gauge my effectiveness in learning, if next time I forget to turn that on I haven't learned much.

I am new to this process, but I did serve as a member of a school board, a high school board of trustees, for 9 years, and I would like to just express some of the frustration that members of school boards feel. I look around this room and I see the tremendous capability. There are a lot of people sitting here. We should probably all adjourn and go out and visit schools and spend some time in schools instead of sitting here figuring how we are going to make schools better. But I really appreciate your testimony and the things that you have said.

Talking about schools and the education bureaucracy blocking change, years ago I had a friend that was principal of one of the high schools in LA City School District. He said they did a survey and found that to implement an idea from the time of the idea until it was thoroughly implemented throughout the LA City School System took 25 years.

I think we don't have that luxury anymore, and we can't spend that kind of time. We need to move quickly. We need to learn how to get through that bureaucracy. If there is some way that we could give the money directly to the school boards, empower the parents, empower the school boards that are closest and have the greatest understanding of what is going on, and the greatest concern because they are their children, then that is what I think we really need to do.

On the school board in California we received 85 percent of our funding from the State, at least 85 from the State and Federal level. Where the money comes from the strings come from. We had very little leeway, really, of things that we could do so it was kind

of community service. It really didn't have much to do with setting educational standards or providing for the young people.

If we could give them more control over the money like you are talking about instead of checking every single category, and if we could realize that just like the people in this room, they are intelligent and able to work programs—if they could spend more time teaching the young people instead of justifying more grants and more money, then I think they would do a better job of turning out the product.

When I started on the school board our budget was about \$18 million. Nine years later it was about \$40 million and we still had roughly the same number of students with a little bit of increase. Most of that money had gone to improving teacher salaries, which was good. They were too low and they needed to be upgraded. But not much had changed other than spending more money. We weren't turning out much of a different product.

I am concerned that we sometimes give money to the schools or districts that have the best grant writers rather than the best programs. I love the things you are talking about, the things that I am hearing here. I hope that we pay good attention to the things they are saying, and do them. We should try to institute those kinds of programs and use the money in the ways they are talking about. Whatever we can do to get more down to the local people and less from here, I think will make an improvement.

Great speech. I don't have any questions. I have been very interested in what you have had to say, though. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. McKeon. You certainly are a welcome member to this committee, and we appreciate your background on a local board of education. That is certainly a labor of love to serve on one of those boards, I know that.

Mr. Green? Mr. Becerra?

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I love to ask dozens of questions, but I will try to limit it to just a few. And I would like to focus on Dr. Boysen's testimony, if I can.

Two or three quick questions. In the restructuring that you testified to, have you discovered any reliable means of estimating the cost of this restructuring? And let me give you the context in which I ask the question.

California, we now have, if not the largest, the second largest class size in the Nation. We have about 4 to 5 million students in our school system. We have, as I said before, kids that speak all sorts of languages. How would this more informal process of teaching, which I agree with, be implemented in a school system the size of California's and given the fiscal constraints that we have?

Commissioner BOYSEN. I worked in California from 1977 to 1990 and from 1987 to 1990 I was the San Diego County Superintendent of Schools, so I was right across the street from the Third World and on the rim of the Pacific and on the threshold of tomorrow with all of the people in California, and I appreciate the diversity and the size that you are talking about.

This approach that is recommended by the Chiefs and others has very much to do with the restructuring that locates accountability in local units against clear standards and assessments, and holds them accountable for all the students that they serve. I think it

can be done on just about any scale, because you have it divided up into units.

I might say that the issue of authentic assessment is extremely important here, because it showcases the right connection between curriculum, testing and professional development, and if we did not have such good measures, I think especially culturally different children would be at a disadvantage. In my experience of working with Hispanic and Filipino and African American and low-income anything is that if you get a clear standard there and you get the right motivation it attracts performance.

Mr. BECERRA. And have you been able to determine in any significant way the costs that might be incurred in doing this transformation into a different type of teaching method?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Actually that particular reform primary has no separate budget. It is intended to be supported by all the money we have out there already as well as this \$108 million that I described that has so many features to it. What I think is significant, as I talk to other Chief State School Officers, is how little leverage money they have. I said we get in Kentucky \$137 million from these Hawkins-Stafford programs and \$108 from the KERA initiatives, but that is why it is so important to make these programs leverage. I think that the money that is in those programs could give a big push, because first of all by changing something like testing in Chapter 1 you would remove an obstacle and it would swing around and produce a good incentive.

But we haven't taken it down to a per student basis. I can say, for example, that the assessment system is about \$7 a student a year. We are spending about \$4,500 a student, so there are—we are spending \$16 a year per student on professional development. That adds up to about \$10 million statewide. So, for \$100 a student a year, you can get a huge impact for change.

Mr. BECERRA. Are you spending more now as a result of the KERA program than you were before?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Yes, we are. Because we had *Lystrada v. Priest* in California, an equity problem, and the money was increased by 30 percent. The State and local money in education went up 30 percent. Most of it was unearmarked to districts, and it was low-income districts. Some of them got 60 percent increases, and at the other end they were about 12 percent. So that is the picture.

Mr. BECERRA. Let me move on to two more questions. You mentioned that you are concerned, and I would be concerned as well, that if you don't earmark these Federal dollars and do categoricals and you just have this clustered programming that there is always a chance that the kids that are supposed to be served by these categoricals would not get all the service they really need.

I need to find a comfort level so I know that if in fact we do allow the consolidation of programs these kids will be served, especially those kids that happen to be in the labor intensive or capital intensive programs, migrant education, and those that are less attractive as well.

Commissioner BOYSEN. I think it is a bit of a fiction that they are being served now. I mean when you get down to the level with aides from four or five different programs and a teacher is trying

to interpret it, the aides are driving the program. The teacher is not driving the program.

So what we have today I don't think is very effective accountability, and when we are looking at what is going to happen to those students—that is why I use the example of the Extended School Services programs where we are just giving out \$33 million a year and each district and school has to decide how to spend it. And, as I visit the schools, and I do that about 20 days a year, I am really impressed with the way the money is being spent.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, if I can be indulged for just a few more seconds?

Last question. Gauging the success of a school's use of Federal funds—it goes along with the previous question—if you don't have any standardized method of testing, if we undo that standardized method and go more towards the assessment of achievement, how would a State in the Northeast compare its achievements for its students using some of those Federal funds with, say, a State on the West Coast, Arizona or California, and how would you know that your children are accomplishing the same amount of my children using this KERA model?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Okay. I am talking about a new form of standardized test. I do not advocate no standardized testing. We are moving from multiple choice—low level, basic skill, multiple choice testing to higher level performance assessment, which includes things like portfolios, performance events, exhibitions, demonstrations. Those two can be compared nationally. In fact, there is a program which is funded out of OERI, or let's say it is funded by foundations right now and States, and we would like to see some OERI money in it. It didn't make it through the last Congress. The new standards project has 17 States. We are collaboratively developing these performance standards.

And then there is an independent means. The National Assessment of Educational Progress has been around for 20 years. It is very valuable. We recommend, the Chiefs do, that it be made State and State and every level.

By the way, in the 1990 math assessment, Kentucky outscored California.

Mr. BECERRA. Okay.

[Laughter.]

Chairman KILDEE. On that note, Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I never heard of California, so.

Gentlemen, you talk a lot about the general vision of reform. I wonder if each of you could try to be a bit more precise and tell us that if there were three things systematically, or systemically that you would like us to change in the reauthorization, Federal level, what would they be?

Commissioner BOYSEN. I would speak to flexibility with accountability, so that we don't have this blizzard of categoricals that really confuse and disorient schools. I would speak to the importance of assessment as the thing that has to give you the picture so you can have a results oriented system in the first place. And I would speak to linking social, health, justice—all human services.

Mr. KIRST. Mine would be very similar. Reorient the system from a fractionated categorical system to a system that focuses on outcomes, standards, and for students and for teachers. Second, try and use the Federal money to glue the system together—to create linkages, to reinforce, not to splinter it in different directions. So that one of the themes would be to make the new money glue money that puts the system together and reinforces it.

And lastly, think about Federal policy in terms of Higher Education Acts, Elementary/Secondary, and the various programs run through HHS and Labor. So thinking about it across committees, across concepts, and how that would come together in schools.

Mr. GUNDERSON. You mean a coordinated education strategy?

Mr. KIRST. Yes.

Mr. WOODSIDE. I don't have much to add to that. I think that would be probably everybody's three key things that we would like to see accomplished.

The one thing that troubles me, though, when we talk about these programs is that in a sense we penalize success by withdrawing funds, rather than rewarding success by increasing funds. We have got a kind of negative incentive built into the whole system, and I think somehow we are going to have to begin to direct the flow of Federal funds in a somewhat different kind of way. Either we give a base amount to each school and reward those that seem to be doing better under the assessment methods or some other way. But it is discouraging to have a system in which the better you do the less money you get as a result of that.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Each of you have talked about flexibility. Tell us, how do we do flexibility and still deal with the constituencies and interest groups out there; in particular, when you get into such things as the special populations, the handicapped, et cetera? We are not very good at succeeding on that. We have tried in some other measures in the past and failed miserably, because the constituencies rise up with their wrath.

How do we do that? And frankly, I don't think we do it unless you are willing to help mobilize the constituency out there in support of that effort.

Mr. WOODSIDE. Well, I talked—as you will see in my paper, I think it really is we have got to utilize everybody we can in the executive and the congressional level as well as the private sector to use in a very good sense their positions in a bully pulpit. I mean we have got to really talk seriously so that understanding of these technical things that we are talking about become an accepted part of the way people look at education and its problems.

There is no easy answer, I don't think, to that, any more than there is to producing overnight teachers qualified to teach the new curriculum. We are going to have to struggle like hell. It has taken us, if you will, almost 50 years to get in this box. It is going to take us at least 25 years to get out.

Mr. KIRST. You hit on something where I absolutely have no answers, that is a huge problem in my mind, which is where do special education fit into this conversation. In most of the State reforms it is well off somewhere on its own. I can't think of one which has really brought it into the front and center and integrated this in a coherent policy. Not only does the Federal Government

have, you know, strong special education specificity. So do the State governments.

I don't know the answer, but we are going nowhere in terms of even entering into that conversation as I go around various States and localities. I think it is a big problem. I wish I had something to suggest. I can't figure it out myself.

Commissioner BOYSEN. I think part of it is the vision you have. We picked for our logo in Kentucky the globe with the State of Kentucky on it with children on the State of Kentucky because that is the competition. And, as I talk to culturally different parents and their representatives about our drive, which is very non-categorical, they have to, for example, buy into the assessment as not being biased against their students.

And this notion that we are all on this much higher trajectory, that they, each interest group, is going to be able to monitor the progress of those students, and in our State virtually all of the students, even special education students, are in the assessment system. They are willing to take that risk.

And we as Chiefs have also suggested that the special education and preschool legislation be—or early childhood, I should say—re-authorized on the same schedule as Hawkins-Stafford in the future.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Quickly, who should coordinate this education/health care service delivery system—the Federal Government, State government, or the local community school? Or somebody else?

Commissioner BOYSEN. It seems to me that it has to happen at all levels. The thing that is making it work in Kentucky is that there is somebody at the grassroots level who is doing the effective, the coordination that makes the difference to the user, that creates the access, that creates all of these efficiencies. Without that person, I don't think that we would have much impact.

At the State level, there is an intergovernmental task force that manages the program.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Sawyer?

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been just a marvelous panel, and I add my thanks to those that we have heard come before, not only to those who participated but to the Chair and his staff who selected them. It was really a worthwhile morning. I have two observations and then two questions.

First, let me just suggest that as frustrating as the Eisenhower program may be, it is vastly more flexible than it was even 5 years ago. The real problem in making Ike long-term is the availability of funds. We think we are beginning to drive the dollars with enough flexibility to local decision-makers who can act in consortia among school districts in a way that can really bring about long-term effect on the quality of science teaching within the classroom itself. It is not there yet, but it is moving in the direction that you have suggested.

The second observation is this. One of the enormous arenas of change that we haven't come to grips with in this country is one that is suggested by the comments about the way in which Chapter 1 funds are driven, and that is the consequences of demographic change in this country. It is not just California. It is the way in which the entire population of this Nation and its workforce are



changing at a pace that we haven't seen in perhaps a century. We have not even begun to come to grips with that.

Those are the two observations. The questions are these, and just let me premise it on this. I share your frustration over the blizzard of categoricals. But every one of those categoricals came about because it was targeted at an unserved need. There has long been stiff competition for resources on the State and the local level, and so the Federal Government sometimes must act.

Moving from that to an outcomes-based system is enormously important. I share the hope of the witnesses from California and Kentucky, that a preferred model of Federal support would be to set high standards and then to provide the equivalent of block grants to LEAs to meet those standards.

The States are in a comparable situation with regard to their local jurisdictions, and my question is: are the States doing that with regard to the dollars that they are distributing, or do they continue to be bound to the notion of categoricals to meet specific needs? Where you have been able to break away from categoricals, how have you gone about applying penalties or rewards without falling into the problem that Mr. Woodside mentioned; of penalizing success, or perhaps even worse, creating failure where assistance may be even more needed?

Mr. KIRST. Well, from the California perspective I think one of the things if we go back into history and the Federal policy—and you are right, it was meant for—the Federal policy hit unmet needs in populations that were not being well served. One of the key conceptual discussions that we are having here is the Federal programs are often around individual pupils or groups of pupils. Not the school as the unit of change, but the pupils, so that you have targeted the money through the school into the pupils. And I think what we are saying is think about the school as the unit rather than the pupils.

Now, when you say that, though, you have to focus the Federal money on the schools that have lots of the pupils that need the services. It can't be sprayed all over the place or you get into the problem of accountability for funding. So I think that one wants to look at the formulas and say, Are there too many schools in these things, in these programs that have very low levels of the pupils we need? Because the more of those you have the less of those you can say we can do—we can use the school as the unit of change.

Mr. SAWYER. Are you saying that concentrations of specific need—

Mr. KIRST. Right.

Mr. SAWYER. [continuing] maybe need to take on a larger role in formula-making—

Mr. KIRST. Exactly. Right. Because if you get the money to the right places, then you can say the school is my concern, not these few pupils in the school—5 percent of the pupils or 10. So yes, the concentration, I think, is very important.

The States—California under budget pressure has been making things much more flexible, and in the last session of the legislature they allowed a lot of moving around of funds, and it is a so-called mega-item out there, which is a significant change in the flexibility of categorical programs. I think that is important.

But, as we have said today, it is not just flexibility. It is ensuring the capacity to teach differently and then some kind of outcome standards.

Commissioner BOYSEN. I might say that the State's, the Chief State School Officers' proposal here is not truly a block grant proposal. It calls for a State to come up with its solution. As you were pointing out, this is also a State policy problem. And one alternative that I am sure I would consider with our State board is what would be a sort of regulatory safety net; that is, as long as these children in this categorical were performing above this level or on this improvement trajectory, which is what we are working on in Kentucky, then you have this running room. But when they don't perform, we doubt your judgment as to what you are doing, and then you get into this regulatory world where you have to be accountable for process as well as product.

Mr. SAWYER. I am not going to ask the other question, but it is one that we debated in this committee last year and it goes right to the heart of some of the things that we have been talking about today. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics went through an enormous amount of work to develop those outcome goals and the curriculum that it will take to achieve them. If anything, they were, perhaps, light on teaching training programs. But then finally at the end of this long process, after the goals and the curriculum, then they developed the instruments with which to assess success or failure.

We have had a great deal of struggle coming to grips with the fact that this is a systemic change and not one that can be driven simply by changing the test instruments at the end, and then hoping that the rest of the process keeps up with it. I don't have time to ask you to comment on that, but perhaps I will write to you.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. Strickland?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Member of Congress, I also would like to say that this panel has been outstanding. I am especially gratified that the Commissioner from Kentucky is here because I have roots in Kentucky, and I was looking through your testimony and I saw reference to the Pikeville Elementary School. Some 20 years ago, as an intern, I remember going into that school testing children for placement in special education classes and other schools throughout eastern Kentucky, and I remember vividly using a trombone case for a table as I was trying to administer an intelligence test to a child and the multiple problems that I witnessed, and I am so appreciative of what Kentucky is doing. I hope Kentucky can lead the way for other States. I represent an Appalachian district in southern Ohio, and many of our problems are the same.

I just have an observation that has grown out of my years of experience as a psychologist and as a teacher, and that is that we seem to have reached a place in our historical development where we have a lot of institutions which attempt to deal with society's problems. Most recently, I worked in a prison where we have a lot of mentally ill people confined. And it seems as though we take society's problems wherever we find them, and today we are talking

about schools specifically, and we try to take those problems and squeeze them into existing institutions rather than looking at our problems as they exist and then thinking of new ways to modify those institutions or create new institutions which speak to the needs of the real problems.

And I was especially interested in what you referred to here as healthy students/safe schools because anyone who has had an introductory course where they have studied Maslow's hierarchy of needs understands that if a child is hungry it is not going to learn, if the child is afraid it is not going to concentrate. And it seems to me that what you are proposing here is a greatly expanded role for the public schools. I am encouraged by that. I think it needs to be done. But I guess I am wondering, given the multiple problems that we have and the shortage of funds that we have, are you courageous enough to say that this is the time to expand the role and the mission of the public school system in these kinds of ways?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Kentucky has said that. There is a very strong capacity-building element in the Family Resource Use Service Centers to empower the family to access these services, and those include employment services and GEDs. As you know, from Pike County and that part of the State, there are many people who—in fact, there has been a real fast acceleration of that program, of the GED program, in the State.

So there is, yes, in the Chiefs' proposal a new program which would build on concepts like the link-up for learning and comprehensive services for children. There is a \$500 million formula grant program which would seed these programs around the country, because I think as soon as you see one of these Friskies operating you see the tremendous efficiency, the tremendous hope.

I want to come back to your main point here, and that is, how much can we take on? And the answer is we can't look away from those impediments to learning, and we can be strategic in dealing with them, and this schools linked to social services, not given in most cases in the school but accessed from the school, is the prudent and in my experience it is just an explosively successful program.

Mr. KIRST. If I could comment on that. I think what we are talking about is not having the school funds using health services and all of this, but the school is sometimes the location for delivery and the school funds are used to glue the system together and make sure that kids get the right services. So it is an expansion of the school role partially as is location of service delivery and of gluing it and referring it and putting it together. but not school funds for health or for social services. I think we will never really pay for that.

One thing that could be done is explicit addressing of this use of the school glue money function and for services, comprehensive services, authorizing that in Chapter 1, saying how do you want Chapter 1 to be—do you want Chapter 1 funds used for that? If so, how do you want the legislation set up to do that? I think that is a very interesting question that needs to be addressed.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I would just like to make one further comment. I like the way you are moving toward assessment, away from so-called standardized, what I consider rather meaningless outcomes.

I also think we need to understand that the children are unique. They learn in different ways. There is no unitary, in my judgment, intelligence. There are intelligences. We need not try to pigeonhole all of our children into a particular curriculum, but we need to recognize the multiple skills and talents that children have and to create curricula and learning opportunities which enable those children to learn what for them is meaningful and will be rewarding for them.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Payne?

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. Unfortunately, I missed the testimony, but from what I hear from my colleagues it was outstanding.

I would like to, though, comment as a former elementary and secondary schoolteacher, and actually a former PTA president. That was unique. But I would like to just commend the State of Kentucky for the tremendous revamping of its educational system. The reason that I am so impressed is that, you know, we are up North and Kentucky seems like the deep South, you know. But they tell me it is border. I don't know what that means. Anyway, they say that Tennessee and Kentucky are border States, so we accepted Mr. Gore.

But the Kentucky situation—and the reason I mention the deep South is because we are up North and New Jersey attempted to do exactly the same thing that happened in Kentucky. And you would expect, you know, the enlightened North. We took the 30 poorest districts and said there should be a reallocation of State funds to cap funding to the richer districts and try to roll some of the needed economic resources to the 30 poorest districts. Because interestingly enough, in our State Constitution—it is one of the only States in the Union that guarantees a thorough and efficient education as a part of the State Constitution. So there was a barter decision that came about with the T&E, we called it—the “thorough and efficient” education situation.

My point is that our Governor, Jim Florio, attempted to do what happened in Kentucky, and his ratings went down about 10 percent—they are moving up a little bit now—and it was basically because of the overreaction of the richer districts refusing to feel that it was equitable to cap the funding in the richer districts. I think even in Jonathan Kozar's book *The Savage Inequities* he talked about Camden, New Jersey, where about \$3,500 per student was spent and maybe 20 minutes away in Princeton it is about \$7,000, and schools in our district in Newark, New Jersey, which is really the third oldest city in the United States, you can imagine the condition of some of the—even the physical condition of some of the schools in the place.

I guess I say all that to say that I wonder if you could tell me what Kentucky did where you would expect what happened in New Jersey. It didn't happen in Kentucky but happened in New Jersey. What did you do—and we even had a court mandate that said in 3 years you could do it. Jim Florio just felt, Well let's do it now and get on it, because he agreed with it. Why the different reaction? And could you tell us how you were able to sort of move it through without the overall explosion that we had in Jersey?

Commissioner BOYSEN. I think for one thing we didn't have an economic downturn right away, and I think that might have been a part of the New Jersey situation.

I said earlier that I am a product of the reform, this position of Commissioner is, and therefore I take no credit for the design. But it was sold very well as an economic development act. I mean there are many reasons why all of this in this country need to think about economic development, and some of the States are farther along in needing to think about it than others, and Kentucky was there. And the backlash that was expected from the \$500 million a year tax increase was not really experienced. There were very few State legislators who were not re-elected who voted for it. We are not out of the woods on that one yet.

But we don't have any festering problem of that kind, and I think it has to do with the way that everyone from the Chamber of Commerce to the Business Roundtable to the academic and political leaders of the State understood that the main issue here was not just that they are going to have more equity, this is an investment in these folks who are going to be leading our country and paying the bills.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Mr. Sawyer, do you want to go back for one more question while we have this panel with us?

Mr. SAWYER. Well, Mr. Chairman, the question really went at the ability to develop systemic reform across a series of complex but closely related arenas including: the development of goals, the development of the means of reaching those goals, providing the curricular means, the equipment, the instruments, the textbooks; the teaching techniques, the means, the hard dollar resources, and ultimately the way to measure success or failure in achieving those goals.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we struggled in the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act—you were a real leader in that—in an attempt to recognize that this was not something that could be accomplished overnight. It requires some very fundamental changes in entire systems of educational funding and governance.

But I was interested in the response of those who clearly have viewed this as a question more complex than the simple enactment of mandated reforms; whether it be in tests and measurements or any other single-facet approach. Are we making any real progress in systemic education reform?

Commissioner BOYSEN. Maybe I could start with the NCTM standards because they have really changed math instruction in Kentucky, because the assessment system, this year we are bringing up math portfolios in fourth, eighth and twelfth grade, and each one of the 50,000 students at each grade level has a collection of his or her work that deals with solving math problems. There is a lot of writing involved, some collaborative work, and we are getting quite a groan out of many of the teachers, as we did last year with the writing portfolios. Because maybe the conventional wisdom is to do it the other way around. You sort of lead with the standards and then you have a lot of professional development and then some curriculum alignment. By that time, most people are

asleep. And what Kentucky has been caused to do by the legislation is to lead with the assessment.

So we have the portfolios out there, and I can tell you the level of interest in the professional development—that is, the \$16 per student, which is about \$400 a teacher—around the State and all of the release time that goes with it—we have up to 9 days a year that can be used for that purpose—is really riveted on what the students need to know in order to do those activities in that portfolio, how can the teacher teach those activities, how will those portfolios be assessed, what does it have to say about the curriculum of study. I think at the classroom level that is how it all gets brought together.

At the State level it gets brought together through something like the systems change bill and Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, which I think is so fundamental to supporting the kind of changes that we are talking about here today.

Mr. KIRST. I would add that the one thing you are going to have to struggle with is differential Federal policy. If you go back into the history, it was to treat the States all alike. Unlike health or human services, we had very little waiver authority or flexibility at the Federal level to differentiate among States. It is striking when you deal with health and human services how they have this kind of flexibility. I think that Congress will have to consider, if they look at States and localities, you will have to have some kind of mechanism to certify that the outcomes these States and localities are moving towards are the outcomes that we as a Congress endorse. Then we can begin to relax some of the categories.

But unless you have some idea of what are outcomes that are most highly valued in terms of what kids know and are able to do, you are going to have difficulty, I think, aligning the rest of the system and triggering Federal assistance.

Mr. WOODSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I have a separate couple of comments, if the Congressman is finished.

We talked earlier about what could the business community do to publicize some of these issues and carry them out. There is an organization called the Business Coalition for Education Reform, and let me just put on the record the various kinds of groups that are in a sense supporting 90 percent at least of the things I have talked about. I don't intend to speak for them. I am speaking for myself, and secondarily for the CED.

But this Coalition involves the American Business Conference, the Black Business Council, Business Higher Education Forum, the Business Roundtable, the Committee for Economic Development, the Conference Board, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Alliance of Business, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Women Business Owners, U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. All of these organizations are supporting in general the things we have been talking about this morning before this committee.

Very specifically, the president of the Business Roundtable would like you all to know that they have produced an outstanding series of Ad Council spots dealing with the very things that we are talking about today: the importance of educational reform to every family in the U.S.

My second point that I would like to stress, since there has been no conversation this morning because technically it is not within this committee's purview. But we have not talked about infrastructure of the education system at all, and I hope all of you will have some kind of input into the package of investment, whether it is \$15 billion, which I think is like spitting in the ocean, or \$50 billion to try to get the economy revved up again that we have an ideal opportunity with plans already laid to support new building in urban communities of a very broken down, decrepit school physical plant.

Chairman KILDEE. I certainly agree with everything you have said, particularly this last point. I am getting a bill drafted right now, working with Mr. Mineta, to see that schools be included in any infrastructure needs. I know for a fact that there are certain school buildings in this country where a Federal judge would not allow us to keep prisoners. They called a jail in my hometown under a Federal court order because it was unfit for prisoners—and it was. But I have seen students in buildings worse than that, and that is a terrible, terrible thing. And I think when we talk about infrastructure we have to include educational infrastructure. I am certainly happy for your point on that.

Mr. Goodling had to go testify before the Rules Committee and he has returned now. Bill?

Mr. GOODLING. I had to sit there two hours and some minutes listening to the Rules Committee debate legislation, which is not what I thought the purpose of the Rules Committee was. But I finally got 5 minutes to ask to offer three amendments to a family and medical leave bill, and I believe those three will be granted. But other than that, it was an experience.

And I told them at the end that we are discussing legislation far more important to this country than anything in the Education and Labor hearing room and that that is where I should be.

Well, I apologize. I did have a lot of questions, but I am told by staff that you discussed most of those and I will read what it was you said. I was sitting up here before I went over there kind of smiling, and if you wondered why, I was reading a Wall Street Journal article. I am sure the people from Kentucky will appreciate this, because I was reading these last two paragraphs:

"The idea behind the multi-age class is that the children learn at different rates. Some 6-year-olds can learn cursive writing and fractions, some can't. They won't be penalized for failing, and the exposure is beneficial.

"Unusual as it sounds, the children seem to have adjusted quickly to being in multi-age classes. They learn from one another like brothers and sisters."

What I was laughing about was the "unusual as it may sound." You know, I go back 59 years—I don't want to tell my age, but I can remember 59 years ago, that is exactly the way we did it. And in education they always say what goes around comes around or something of that nature. And I always said at that time the finest education that any student could have was a self-contained, multi-grade classroom if you had an outstanding teacher. Now, if you didn't, and you got a poor teacher for 4 years, then that was a terrible experience.

Fortunately, I had a magnificent teacher and that is exactly what we did. Those who were more advantaged helped those who weren't, and up until we got to the last year we were always learning from what was going on from the older youngsters. Then when we got to the last year, of course, we had all heard it four times, but that was reinforced and, you know, that made us that much better when we got to fifth grade.

I think when I came in you may have been discussing something that has been near and dear to me, and a lot of us have tried to promote. We haven't been able to accomplish too much along the lines of flexibility simply because there are those who fear that somehow or other we can't write what we want as the end result in such a manner that you folks out there will not do it properly, and therefore, the money won't get to the people that we wanted it to get to and for the purpose we wanted.

Now, I believe that we are creative enough up here that we can write the legislation in such a manner that you must accomplish the goals that we have set. We are giving you some opportunity to determine how you do that.

I use as an illustration—it may not be the best, but if you have a grant for bilingual education and the child you are trying to service is also a special education youngster, I think I am right in saying you darn sight better be sure that you can show any auditor that comes in there that every penny is going exactly in bilingual where it is supposed to go, you know. It is the same student. It seems to me you can be creative and do it in such a manner that you serve all the needs.

One of the problems I run into when we reauthorize Chapter 1 and programs of that nature is that I always looked at those programs as being over and above everything else. Unfortunately, I have done some observing where that is true. I have also done some observing where it was get that kid out of my class, and sometimes I worried that the child was spending more time going from special class to special class than they were really getting any kind of instruction. So I would hope that we can tighten that in some manner so that it is over and above everything else that they would get.

But I would hope that you would come up with a sales pitch for us that we can do something more than we have done in the past in relationship to flexibility. And, you know, we will need help to sell that. As I said, that fear is here on the committee. I think we have done something on the education side. We haven't gotten there on the labor side yet. On the education side we have come into the 21st century in this committee, and that wasn't easy to do. We are moving close to it, I will put it that way. On the labor side, we are still back in the 1950s and the 1960s, and I don't think we will ever get to the 21st century. But that is not your problem, that is our problem.

Chairman KILDEE. We are trying to pull you that way.

[Laughter.]

Mr. GOODLING. Yes. They are trying to pull me back into the 1950s and the 1960s and the 1970s.



Chairman KILDEE. To any degree that we have moved towards the 21st century on the education side, I certainly want to give Mr. Goodling credit for that.

Mr. GOODLING. Well, we do it together.

Chairman KILDEE. It is a pleasure working with you, Bill. You are just a tremendous asset to this committee, and an asset to education in this country.

You may continue now.

Mr. GOODLING. I am really afraid I am going to plow ground that you have already plowed, and I don't want to waste their time like mine was wasted over on the other side. So, if anyone else hasn't had the time, I will listen.

Chairman KILDEE. Well, I want to——

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman KILDEE. Yes?

Mr. SAWYER. I just want to disassociate myself with the remarks of a couple of our colleagues who are now departed. I hope these guys will come back long before the football outcomes or the testing outcomes make that possible.

[Laughter.]

Chairman KILDEE. I want to thank the panel. This has been an excellent panel. One of the advantages of serving in the Congress of the United States is having people with your depth, your understanding, your devotion testify before us. This is going to be very, very helpful.

I really want the Federal Government to be a helpful and encouraging partner in systemic reform. Both helpful and encouraging, in every sense of the word encouraging. I have always said that education generally is a local function, a State responsibility, but a very, very important Federal concern, and I want to make sure we enhance that Federal concern as we try to improve systemically education in this country. And you have played a very, very major role with your testimony here today.

And, unless there are additional comments, we will keep the record open for 2 additional weeks for any further submissions. Without that, then the subcommittee is adjourned. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]



## HEARING ON H.R. 6: THE ROLE OF ESEA PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL REFORM

---

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,  
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m. Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale E. Kildee, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Unsoeld, Reed, Roemer, Green, Woolsey, Romero-Barcelo, English, Strickland, Goodling, Petri, Roukema, and Gunderson.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Jack Jennings, education counsel; Diane Stark, legislative specialist; Jeff McFarland, subcommittee counsel, Margaret Kajeckas, legislative associate; Lynn Selmsen, professional staff member; Jane Baird, education counsel; and Tom Kelley, legislative associate.

Ms. ENGLISH. [presiding] The subcommittee will please come to order.

Mr. Kildee is temporarily held up. He is at a whip meeting, and the President has joined them. In his place, I will start the meeting. I am Karan English from Arizona, and this is my first time up here, so please be patient.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education convenes this morning for the second in a series of hearings on H.R. 6, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1993. Today we will continue our discussion of education reform efforts and how ESEA and its related programs can contribute to those efforts.

Our discussion has centered around three questions and an important overriding principle. These questions are: What is happening in school reform across the country? What is the role of Federal education programs in existing reform efforts? How should Federal programs be revised to support school reform?

The principle is that our education system must respond to the total child, the child's direct educational needs, as well as other needs which affect a child's ability to learn. These later needs may be health-related or the result of societal problems such as drugs, homelessness, and the changed nature of many families.

Today's witnesses will bring additional perspectives to this discussion. They include the Honorable Donald M. Carroll, Jr., Secre-

tary, Pennsylvania Department of Education; Dr. James Renier, chairman and CEO, Honeywell; Dr. Susan Fuhrman, director, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University; and Mr. Donald Ernst, director of education policy, Office of Governor Bayh, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Before we begin, I would like to yield to my good friend and ranking Republican member of both the subcommittee and full committee, Mr. Goodling, for any opening comments that he may have.

Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you. I would just encourage you to stay around 30 years, and perhaps you can have that chair permanently. It will probably take 30 years.

I want to welcome all of you this morning, but I particularly want to welcome my Secretary of Education from Pennsylvania, Secretary Don Carroll. We go back a long way as superintendents of school districts, different school districts, some years ago. I am very pleased that we have Secretary Carroll as our Secretary in Pennsylvania and look forward to his testimony to find out all the things that I should know about what is happening in Pennsylvania and perhaps don't at this particular time.

I am very interested in these hearings, because I think it is time to stop talking about what we need to do to change things in education and get around to doing them and, particularly, giving States and local districts the flexibility to do them right, rather than us saying there's only one way to do it. We can tell you what end results we would like to have, then we should allow you to use your creative talent to bring about those changes.

I hope that we will be able to get more flexibility into our legislation as we reauthorize all of the elementary and secondary programs. I also believe we need to look at coordination of services. I think one of our problems, and it is getting worse, is that every committee wants to be involved in education since it has become sexy. So everybody and their brother is coming up with all these wonderful ideas, and the left hand doesn't know what the right is doing.

We were talking about programs for training, and we discovered there are 143 Federal programs for training and retraining people. I'm sure I have no idea what they are, other than those that may come from this committee. It's just no way to run a railroad, and we have to make changes.

So I look forward to your testimony. I apologize for running in and out. I'm supposed to be with Senator Dole at this time over in the Capitol, and I'm supposed to be testifying in a few minutes before a committee that is going to reform the Congress of the United States. I want to see that day! But, at least we're going to talk about it anyway.

So, again, I look forward to your testimony.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Goodling.

Would either of the other members care to make an opening statement?

[No response.]

Ms. ENGLISH. Our first witness is Secretary Carroll.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD M. CARROLL, JR., SECRETARY,  
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HARRISBURG,  
PENNSYLVANIA**

Secretary CARROLL. Thank you. I am happy to be here. I am Don Carroll. I am Secretary of Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

What I have tried to do is to present what I hope will be the briefest testimony in congressional history by presenting to you three pages of ideas that go at the three questions we were asked to look at.

Where are we going nationally? I think it would be presumptuous for me to talk about that, although I think we all kind of know where we're going. But I do know what is happening in Pennsylvania, and we're a reasonably good model State. And then to talk about where Federal programs help us do what we're trying to do and where we might want to go in order to make the Federal programs more useful.

The final page of my testimony is a resolution adopted by our State Board of Education, by a very thoughtful member who is a law professor at Rutgers and who spends considerable time studying governmental activities. He introduced the motion, and it was passed unanimously. I will say to you, that hangs over anything I saw, which is around the, at times, detrimental effects of a small amount of money leveraging entire State programs.

I will give one example of that. The Perkins Act gives to Pennsylvania perhaps 4 to 6 percent of its total vocational education budget; 96 percent, roughly, comes from the State and local government. Yet the Perkins plan, that little bit of money, governs and directs the vocational education program in Pennsylvania. That's nice, if you're on the leveraging side and can be all-wise, but I would suggest to you that sometimes you might want to look at the effect of that leveraging.

There are other places. I notice we were talking at some length about something called school equity. Before we start to deal with some of the main purposes of the legislation, I frankly think that's a State responsibility. We're going to take some dramatic moves next Tuesday when our governor introduces his budget. We recognize, and I think all States do, that there are inequities. We should fix them, but I don't think you should lever various Federal programs around the question of equity. Those are the kinds of things we will talk about.

But to reinforce what I know you have to be hearing about what is going on in education in this country, I would just like to make a few points. One of the most dramatic changes, and the one that is causing the most controversy in Pennsylvania, is the whole notion that we should stop rewarding kids for how long they have been sitting in class and get to the fact of what they know and how they can use it through performance standards.

Right now, the Carnegie unit still dominates in this country: 120 clock hours, one 47-minute period across the day, particularly at the secondary level. The elementary people have been wiser and have abandoned all that stuff a long time ago. That's why they

have the best instruction. Not to pick on my secondary friends, but that's just the way it works out.

What we need to be able to say to parents is, here is what your child should know, and then, here is what your child knows. And we will insist that there are competencies attained before that child graduates from high school. That way we can at least list and talk to folks about the important things about education; again, knowledge and the application of it.

Now, to be fair to that trust, we must have far more rigorous standards, those assessment standards. The assessments need to be broader than the normal paper-and-pencil tests given on a Tuesday morning, multiple choice tests given on a Tuesday morning in February; the development of actual records of what these children can do, pictures of their science fair, if you will, pictures and write-ups of their science fair projects; speaking; forensics; a whole lot of things that students can do, that they can demonstrate that they have also not only understood English but can apply it.

In Pennsylvania, we're also looking at a problem I think you are, I hope you are, which is, how do you coordinate all of these programs into one? We had a study, as everyone does—you always start off with a good study—and we listed a number of the programs that affect children, about 155—I'm not sure exactly of the number—almost as much as vocational education.

And then we listed the departments that are concerned with that program, and we did a sort of balloon city thing. If your department was primarily in charge, you got a red balloon, a little sticker there, and what have you. The chart was beautiful. It was so colorful. And it had all kinds of places where people bump into each other at the service delivery area.

So our governor formed a children's cabinet made up of health, welfare, and education, with Juvenile Court judges and others on call, and told us to crack heads. And we're beginning to get some sort of a system where you give up a little turf for efficiency. At some places in our government there are people who would not want to give up a program, even though, in the passage of time, it's not suitable for them. So we have been working out transfers of program, and I think we need to look at that throughout government.

I don't want to go down too much on the list except to highlight a couple of other things. I think, from time to time, we overlook the use of libraries as tremendous adjuncts to education, after school, Saturdays, during summers, and actually during the school day. And I'm speaking not only of school libraries but public libraries.

These libraries are sort of thinning out across the country. They need support, and everyone tries to do that. No one says bad things about libraries. People just don't do good things for libraries. And we see them as tremendously important to education, libraries are, in the Department of Education in Pennsylvania, so it's a particular concern of mine.

Finally, just on what is happening, because I know you can look at the rest of this, one of the exciting things that is happening is the cooperation of business and education and labor. Where we were 10 years ago was, let's have adopt-a-school programs, and let's

have a company adopt a school, and let's have the school say to the company what it is that you would like us to do for you, a tour of the plant or what have you. Did not work. Would not work.

But now what we have is, in our State, we have a Pennsylvania 2000 group that is made up of chief executives from the Pennsylvania Round Table, who are also members of the National Business Round Table, and we have them meeting on a regular basis. They are providing us with tremendously valuable intellectual assistance as we try to change the way our schools operate. In fact, we participated in a study done by the National Business Round Table; they refer to it as a gap study. We find that very, very helpful in terms of our future planning.

So there are a lot of things happening in this country. You've heard about them all. I'm here mainly to reinforce the fact that the world is moving on, and I think our programs, Federal and State, had better move along with them, and there are areas where we can do that.

If you look at supportive things on the second page—if you don't have it, I'll just go through some of these—but what your programs do to help us most is when they provide for staff development, when they provide for upgrading the whole program, not just the pull-out type activities. Quite frankly, I think we made an horrendous mistake in having certain kids get certain things, then they return to an environment that is not conducive to learning for the rest of the day.

So we're looking at how we can create, as we have, for example, done in the City of Philadelphia with their food program, we have a universal feeding program now where the whole school is just declared eligible, and we don't go through the paperwork, and we don't do things like that, we simply feed the kids in that school. I don't know why that can't be done in Chapter 1 and a whole lot of other programs.

So I'm recommending to you that you look at the whole notion that it's an environment that counts, not an individual kid being pulled out. They need those special services, but they also need them reinforced throughout the day.

I don't need to, I think, talk to you much about parent involvement and pilot projects. We need time and space to move and to try out new things without fear of risk, or audit exception, or inspectors general descending on us. You make that possible by the words that you provide. You put words in those laws, and that decides for us a lot of times about how we're audited, how we're investigated, and that sort of thing. We, again, ask for your thoughtfulness on that issue.

And then, finally, there are many ways to assess, as I said earlier, a child's progress. And what I think we need to do is to look at something other than standardized tests and typical kinds of measures to report to you on how well we're doing. I don't think you get the straight story, folks. I think we give you test scores. You assume that's the picture of what is going on, and it really isn't. And you just need to walk through these schools, and I suspect every one of you does this on a regular basis, and simply ask people about it. So more imaginative assessment certainly is required.

There are some things that you could do for us that we would find—I think, in Pennsylvania, we would find helpful. We are just inundated with different definitions of kids to be served. Isn't it possible to come up with, like, more common definitions to say, here are the kids we're targeting? Do I have to always look at a particular definition for a program that sits side-by-side in the school with another program, different age requirements at times? It might be possible to bring those together as much as possible.

Again, latitude in initiating schoolwide projects rather than individual children projects, and liberalize, please, the waiver process. I mean, there are times when we know that we're doing the wrong thing for a group of kids, but we're required to do it. And there ought to be a simpler way of getting—what would you call that?—some freedom to do some experimentation, and so forth.

The other suggestions are in the written testimony. I would just make one gratuitous one before I stop, and that is, one of the most successful programs that we have is a program called Even Start.

I'm not that much of a veteran of Federal activity, but I do notice something that you do that I think is pretty nice. Coming from a Democratic administration in Pennsylvania, I think someday, along the line, it might be nice to declare the Even Start legislation the Goodling Bill and give him his name for the legislation that he wanted. And I'm not even counting on his vote for half the stuff I'm talking about, so you can—because it is well earned.

Thank you for giving me the chance to start this group.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Donald M. Carroll, Jr., follows:]



Donald M. Carroll, Jr.  
Secretary of Education  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

**WHAT IS HAPPENING IN PENNSYLVANIA IN THE AREA  
OF SCHOOL REFORM**

1. CHANGE FROM A TIME-BASED CURRICULUM TO A PERFORMANCE-BASED CURRICULUM.
2. MORE RIGOROUS SCHOOL DISTRICT AND STATE ASSESSMENT AND BETTER COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS.
3. FORMAL COORDINATION AMONG CHILD SERVICE AGENCIES (DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, PUBLIC WELFARE, EDUCATION AND THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE) THROUGH A CHILDREN'S CABINET.
4. FORMAL REPORTING OF A PUPIL'S PROGRESS, FACE TO FACE, TEACHER AND PARENT.
5. STRONG INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS IN THE EDUCATION OF THEIR CHILDREN.
6. IMPROVED MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN THROUGH SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CLINICS AND RELATED MEDICAL SERVICES.
7. DRAMATIC EXPANSION OF ALL TYPES OF NUTRITION PROGRAMS.
8. MORE PRECISE DELEGATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING TO DISTRICT BOARDS OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES.
9. REVAMPING OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS EMPHASIZING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AS OPPOSED TO TIME SPENT IN CLASS.
10. USE OF LIBRARIES AS ADJUNCTS TO SCHOOL INSTRUCTION, PARTICULARLY AFTER SCHOOL AND DURING THE SUMMER.
11. INCREASED USE OF ALL TYPES OF TECHNOLOGY WHERE APPROPRIATE.

**HOW SHOULD FEDERAL PROGRAMS BE CHANGED  
TO SUPPORT SCHOOL REFORM**

1. USE COMMON DEFINITIONS ACROSS ALL FEDERAL PROGRAMS.
2. INCREASE LATITUDE IN DETERMINING SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS.
3. INCREASE FLEXIBILITY FOR SEAS TO MAKE EDUCATION DECISIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY.
4. INCREASE LATITUDE IN SUPPORTING STATE TESTING INITIATIVES.
5. INCREASE LATITUDE IN DETERMINING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS.
6. INCREASE LATITUDE IN CLUSTERING CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS AND ATTAINING WAIVERS FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS.
7. INCREASE LATITUDE IN IDENTIFYING BUILDINGS NEEDING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT/SCHOOL REFORM.
8. INCREASE FLEXIBILITY IN DETERMINING ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT AT LOCAL LEVEL.

**HOW DO FEDERAL CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS  
FIT INTO REFORM EFFORTS**

1. PROVIDES FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT.
2. PROVIDES FOR UPGRADING THE ENTIRE CURRICULUM OF BUILDINGS WITH HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF LOW INCOME.
3. PROVIDES FOR EFFECTIVE PARENT INVOLVEMENT TRAINING.
4. PROVIDES FOR STATE INITIATIVES AND PILOT PROJECTS.
5. PROVIDES FOR COORDINATION OF SOME FEDERAL PROGRAMS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL.
6. PROVIDES FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING.
7. PROVIDES FOR IDENTIFYING AND DISSEMINATING EFFECTIVE PRACTICES.
8. PROVIDES FOR ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF ASSESSMENT AT LOCAL LEVEL.



# Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

## STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

### R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) is up for reauthorization in 1993; and

WHEREAS, An advisory committee on Chapter 1 has recommended extensive changes in the authorizing legislation, including a provision tying state receipt of Chapter 1 money to compliance with standards of fiscal equity approved by Congress; and

WHEREAS, In the areas of vocational education and the education of children with disabilities major policy decisions are being made by Washington, although the national government is contributing less than 10% of the total cost of both these programs; and

WHEREAS, There is no justification for the Congress attempting to impose its priorities on the states generally, on the basis of an appropriation of Chapter 1 money which represents less than 5% of what states are currently spending on public education, K-12; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the State Board of Education expresses its opposition to any attempt to condition the receipt of Chapter 1 money on state compliance with federal standards which affect the expenditure of state and local revenues, and especially to any attempt to condition the receipt of Chapter 1 money on state compliance with federal standards of fiscal equity; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Board urges that a similar position be adopted by the National Association of State Boards of Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Governors' Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to all members of Pennsylvania Congressional delegation.

Given under my hand and our seal  
this 9th day of July, 1992

Sister M. Lawrence Antoun  
Sister M. Lawrence Antoun  
Chairperson

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Goodling, would you care to ask a brief question before you have to leave?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Secretary, we exchanged a letter just recently—and I wonder if you might want to expand a little on the concerns as you expressed in the letter.

Secretary CARROLL. Are you referring to the equity letter? I think you are.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, on the equity issue.

Secretary CARROLL. Well, yes. There are several reports pertaining to Chapter 1 that would indicate that financial equity, either planned or actual program, has to be in place before certain things are triggered.

Now, the amount of money that States and others put into education is broad, as you all know. And here we are looking at a very important program with a lot of dollars, and what we're saying—the possibility of saying that, if you want this money, you had better have fiscal equity. And sometimes that fiscal equity could take four or five years, if we get on it right now. We're looking at probably a four-year program that we're going to start next Tuesday, but it's going to take time.

My concern is that we, again, take a Federal program and we use it to lever some activity on the part of the States far, far beyond the scope of that program. And I was trying to convey that to our folks in Congress.

Mr. GOODLING. I have concerns with that also, because I realize that sometimes a per-pupil expenditure in one area does not include what a per-pupil expenditure does in some other area, and that can become very, very misleading.

Secretary CARROLL. My attorneys would shoot me for this, because they keep telling me to be quiet because we have a lawsuit. It's not going anywhere; it's sitting there. But this is right on the record.

Our highest-paying district pays \$10,900 for each pupil, and our lowest is \$3,400. Now, I'm not saying that they have to be equal and that money is not important, but I am saying that we need to look thoughtfully at bringing the bottom level up. And how high the upper level goes, there are some serious questions about whether we ought to cap taxes, for example, say you can't raise any more taxes for school purposes when you get to a certain thing.

I think it's a far more complicated issue that should not be tied in to Chapter 1 reauthorization, is my point.

Mr. GOODLING. Again, I want to thank you very much for your testimony and again say we're doing good things in Pennsylvania. And I look forward to that continuing. Hopefully we will not hinder you, but help you as we reauthorize these programs. Hopefully, we'll give you a little more flexibility than we have given you in the past, and a little more trust that you may know as much as we know. We won't say that you know more than we know, but maybe we'll say you know as much.

Secretary CARROLL. Congressman, the whole system is built on distrust. School boards don't trust teachers, so they regulate at the policy level. We don't trust school boards, so we regulate them. You don't trust us, so you regulate us. And I don't know what they're

doing at The Hague, but probably in Europe there's someone trying to regulate what you do.

It's a horrible system, particularly when you're dealing with kids. The whole system is a system of distrust, and maybe we can do some small things to rectify.

Mr. GOODLING. I hope so. Thank you.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you.

Mr. Roemer, would you care to make a comment?

Mr. ROEMER. Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you.

I would just say, in terms of a segue here in talking about trust, somebody that I would like to recognize here on your distinguished panel—and I welcome the entire panel here this morning and am very anxious to hear what you all have to say, but I would particularly like to welcome Mr. Don Ernst from the great State of Indiana.

Don, I'm very much looking forward to your expert testimony this morning.

And just to very succinctly tell our audience and our committee about Don's expertise, I had my staff prepare an outline of all that he has accomplished. It is this entire pamphlet of about five pages, so I won't go into that. I will just say that he has been extremely helpful in coming up with good, innovative ideas to help reform and change the face of the school systems in the State of Indiana.

Before helping us in the State of Indiana, he worked for a governor from a small State. That State was the State of Arkansas. That governor, who he worked for, is now the President of the United States. And we all know what the President did when he was Governor of Arkansas in helping to reform some of the schools in Arkansas.

So I very much look forward to your testimony this morning and look forward to our meeting later on today, too, Don. Welcome.

Mr. ERNST. Thank you, Congressman.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Dr. Renier.

Mr. PETRI. I did have a question, too. Is that all right?

Ms. ENGLISH. I'm sorry.

Mr. PETRI. Just very briefly, I notice you talked about——

Ms. ENGLISH. May I interrupt you for just a moment?

Mr. PETRI. Yes.

Ms. ENGLISH. I allowed Mr. Goodling to ask a question because he had to leave. What I would really like to do is hear all the witnesses before we ask questions, if you don't mind.

Mr. PETRI. Oh, sure. Sure.

Ms. ENGLISH. Okay. Thanks.

I would especially like to welcome you, Dr. Renier. Honeywell employs 9,000 Arizonans. We are very pleased to have Honeywell and the business that it brings to Arizona. I'm also pleased to see Honeywell has taken an interest in educating our children as well. With that, I welcome you here this morning, and I'm anxious to hear your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF JAMES J. RENIER, CHAIRMAN AND CEO,  
HONEYWELL, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA**

Dr. RENIER. Thank you. I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to make a statement. I testified at a hearing of this committee in May of 1991, and it is very gratifying to be invited back.

Education is a subject of major importance to me because of my work with organizations such as the Committee for Economic Development, the Health and Human Services School Readiness Initiative, the Business Round Table, and the New American Schools Development Corporation.

In the course of this work, I have visited with many school administrators and teachers and with many community groups around the country. What I have seen and heard leads me to a conclusion that I would like to share with you. If we are to successfully reform education, we're going to have to first reform the communities in which we live. Should it be a surprise that the public schools mirror the communities that they serve? We have to redesign the way community agencies and the schools interact.

One experience that convinces me of this was becoming a temporary principal at a middle school in suburban Minneapolis. When I went to the school, the principal gave me a briefing paper which said that the school had an outstanding staff and the teachers were doing an excellent job. Then on another page he wrote that the school ranks last in academic achievement of all the schools in the district.

What a paradox, I thought. How could you say the staff is doing an excellent job if the kids aren't learning at a high level? The answer, I realized, is that the principal meant his staff is doing great work, considering the social conditions they have to deal with.

The conditions are, in fact, pretty dismaying. In the district, there are pockets of poverty and areas of low-cost housing where there is a highly transient population. Student turnover may be as high as 40 percent in a given school year. Many students live with a single parent.

I want to emphasize that this is not a school in a deprived inner city ghetto. It was in a suburb of Minneapolis, an area that offers some of the best living conditions in the United States. But even here the faculty estimates that about one student in eight has a learning handicap of some kind. The staff knows they can't teach these youngsters until they get them prepared to learn. I estimated that helping students get over their learning barriers takes as much as 25 percent of the school's total professional resources.

The time I spent at the school was short. It was long enough to teach me an important lesson. Just as we have to get our schools ready for the 21st century, we have to get our children ready for the schools.

Important Federal programs such as Head Start, AFDC, Childhood Immunization, and the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children are major factors in helping families prepare youngsters to start kindergarten. These programs should have full funding, by all means, but we must also address the



changing needs of children already in elementary and secondary schools, children who go to school every day with emotional and health handicaps.

It is not necessary to remind this committee of the critical need to improve the ways we get children ready to learn and to achieve better educational outcomes. But we should all recognize that, if we want the schools to send the community better graduates, the community has to take the responsibility to send the school better students.

The schools can't cure the community's ills. Those problems have to be prevented in the first place. They should never reach the schools. Our major economic competitors in Germany and Japan make prevention work. It's a secret they know that we're going to have to learn. Business people have already learned that lesson. Many of them have to learn it a very hard way.

Now we know that preventing problems before they happen is one of the most powerful ideas to come along since the industrial revolution. In industry, it is the total quality way of working, and it is revitalizing all of American business.

Prevention means making sure that children start kindergarten healthy and curious and that every day until graduating they go to school able and eager to learn. Today, we're not doing that. Instead, we have left it to the schools to provide the services needed.

That's an inviting way out, because schools are there and are organized. They are a large system, and students are readily reached in the school. But there are two overriding problems. First, the schools don't have the resources. They are being told to provide health programs, day care, drug education, parental education, counseling for dropouts, AIDS instruction, suicide prevention and, in my State, there are 52 mandates, 32 of which are hard core social mandates.

These and many other programs are often mandated by both State and Federal legislation, and most are underfunded. The president of a State teachers union said, and I quote, "What we used to call teaching is now morning-to-night service to families. Some days it looks like nobody else is helping."

Schools simply don't have the human, physical, and financial resources for both the social and the academic missions. Teachers now have so much extra responsibility that it cuts traditional teaching time, we estimate, in Minnesota, in half. A study by the Minnesota Department of Education concluded, and I quote, "The picture that emerges is one of real crisis management."

In every school district that I visited, administrators, teachers, and school boards are grappling with their social problems valiantly, but, at the same time, they are trying to reassure their communities that they understand the challenge to the schools and that education is being improved. I believe this is denial and I believe a grave error in strategy.

We cannot solve a problem unless we admit that we have it. The schools can't be faulted for dedication, effort, or resourcefulness. But nobody likes to be the messenger of bad news, and the schools have failed to make the outside world understand the reality that they are now dealing with.

The second problem is that even the social support programs that are available are difficult for the schools to access. A principal reason is that, as you heard earlier, children's programs are currently scattered all over the government, divided between Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services. Within departments they are further distributed amongst agencies. The same problem is reflected in many of the States. In Minnesota, for example, Governor Arne Carlson identified 250 children's programs administered through 33 different State agencies.

To cope with the clutter and the confusion, the governor has created, for the first time, a children's cabinet, consisting of the heads of all State government agencies that provide services for children. The cabinet has inventoried all children's programs in the State and is now developing an integrated type of budget.

Now the governor has proposed the next step, creating a new department, the Minnesota Department of Children and Education services. This State department will mean that other departments have to be changed, and, in some cases, existing agencies will be abolished. However, as the governor has said, and I quote from our governor, "We cannot let longstanding battles over turf and reverence for institutions stop us from taking meaningful steps for children and their families."

There is much the Federal Government can do to untangle the administrative webs that make it difficult for communities to implement programs and make them hard to administer at the school district level. I would ask that government leaders take the bully pulpit and pressure States and cities to simplify, as well. Unless we can coordinate services we offer to children and make delivery more direct, these services will not reach their full potential at all in improving education.

The community program that works toward this objective is the New Vistas High School in Minneapolis. It was designed to coordinate the work of a number of agencies in order to bring social services to students directly in their school, where they can be reached most efficiently. Each of the students is a teenage mother or about to become one. They take all the regular classes required for graduation, and in addition they receive the services that young mothers must have. The school also provides preschool to help their toddlers to get off to a good start. And we believe this school will help create a different life for two or three generations and more.

The school brings together the contribution of many collaborators. It occupies specially designed space in our corporate headquarters of my company, Honeywell. We also provided start-up funding and equipment, along with IBM. Instruction is provided by the Minneapolis Public Schools, so it is a Minneapolis public school.

The United Way was responsible for coordination and communication in the program. Child care is funded by Hennepin County. On-site medical attention is supplied by the Minneapolis Health Services and also by the Children's Hospital in Minneapolis. And on-site social workers are from Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

We think the school is making a real difference. Students are graduating, taking jobs or going on to colleges and vocational schools. We are about to start a school in business apprenticeship,

very much along the lines developed in Germany, for these young moms.

Another Minnesota cooperative venture is designed to spread the collaboration philosophy of the New Vistas school. The program is named after its objective. We call it the Learning Readiness Program. The goal of the program is to help communities coordinate services to reach children directly in their schools, right where they are. The purpose is not to load up the schools, again, but to facilitate services where they have not been available until now and to help raise the funding required.

This venture involves the county, an agency called the Youth Coordinating Board, the Minneapolis Public Schools, one of the suburban school districts, the Robinsdale School District, the United Way, the City of Minneapolis, and Honeywell. Funding is also highly ecumenical. We have a half million dollars from the United States Department of Health and Human Services; we raised \$600,000 from the private sector in the area; and Hennepin County awarded the program another \$400,000.

What we're trying to do with these programs is to make delivery of services simple and direct. Our observation at this point is that collaboration really works.

The essential point of my testimony is that it's time to coordinate Federal programs designed to benefit children. Although Federal dollars are a relatively small percentage of the total we spend on children's services, these dollars pretty much often force the structure in which all dollars are spent.

Prior to coming here, I was thinking it would be great if you could get all your committees together and maybe have one from each committee that represents all the services and start talking together about this, as opposed to each one acting like a Chinese bureaucracy. Each program enacted for education has its own mini-bureaucracy, unfortunately, its own regulations, objectives, and turf defenses. Beyond these are adjacent programs such as WIC, AFDC, Immunization, and others which impact education.

A challenge to government agencies is administering these programs harmoniously, supporting each other, not competing among themselves. Independent action may suffice for cures, but prevention strategies demand collaboration. In fact, in this entire educational and social area, I believe there is no way to solve the problems if we retain as much individualism as we have and we're always curing things. We have to collaborate to prevent things. That's the real answer.

For example, births to teenagers continue to increase. In 1989, they exceeded half a million. By some estimates, teenage mothers may account for 20 percent of school dropouts. It is essential that this group be rescued. But in almost every State the problems of dropout mothers fall to the department of education, and the problems of their children fall to the department of human services. Logic, then, seems to follow the funding streams rather than common sense. A seasoned business person may suspect that a major part of the reason, again, is turf protection.

As you and this committee deliberate the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, one significant objective will be to cause our social expertise to become available to the

schools. Across the country, it is not, and the schools are building their own social bureaucracies. The schools then, hopefully, can return to the job we demand they perform, and that's teaching our children.

Simplicity in coordination will help accomplish that. It will help to make sure kids get the emotional, intellectual, and physical support that develops curiosity and motivation, and these are the first requisites of a successful education.

Again, I thank you and the committee for the opportunity to speak at this hearing.

[The prepared statement of James J. Renier follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES RENIER, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,  
HONEYWELL INC.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to make a statement today. I testified at a hearing of this committee in May of 1991, and it is very gratifying to be invited back.

Education is a subject of major importance to me because of my work with organizations such as the Committee for Economic Development, the HHS School Readiness Initiative, the Business Roundtable and New American Schools.

In the course of this work I have visited with many school administrators and teachers, and with many community groups around the country. What I have seen and heard leads me to a conclusion that I would like to share with you: If we are to successfully reform education, we must reform the communities we live in. Should it be a surprise that the public schools mirror the communities they serve? We have to redesign the way community agencies and the schools interact.

One experience that convinces me of this was becoming a temporary principal at a middle school in suburban Minneapolis.

When I went to the school, the principal gave me a briefing paper which said that the school had an outstanding staff and the teachers were doing an excellent job. Then on another page, he wrote that the school ranks last in academic achievement of all the schools in the district.

What a paradox! How could you say the staff is doing an excellent job if the kids aren't learning at a high level? The answer, I realized, is that the principal meant his staff is doing great work considering the social conditions they have to deal with.

The conditions are, in fact, pretty dismaying. In the district there are pockets of poverty and areas of low-cost housing where there is a highly transient population. Student turnover may be as high as 40 percent in a school year. Many students live with a single parent.

I want to emphasize that this is not a school in a deprived inner-city ghetto. It was in a suburb of Minneapolis—an area that offers some of the best living conditions in the country. But even here the faculty estimates that about one student in eight has a learning handicap of some kind.

The staff knows they can't teach these youngsters until they get them prepared to learn. I estimated that helping students get over their learning barriers takes as much as 25 percent of the school's total professional resources.

The time I spent at the school was short—but it was long enough to teach me an important lesson: Just as we have to get our schools ready for the 21st century, we have to get our *children* ready for the *schools*.

Important Federal programs such as Head Start, AFDC, Childhood Immunization and the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children are major factors in helping families prepare youngsters to start kindergarten. These programs should have full funding. But we must also address the changing needs of children already in elementary and secondary schools—children who go to school every day with emotional and health handicaps.

It is not necessary to remind this committee of the critical need to improve the ways we get children ready to learn and to achieve better educational outcomes. But we should all recognize that if we want the schools to send the community better graduates, the community has to send the school better students.

The schools can't cure the community's ills. Those problems have to be prevented—they should never reach the schools. Our major economic competitors in Germany and Japan, make prevention work. It's a secret *they* know that *we* have to learn.

Business people have already learned that lesson—many of them have had to learn the hard way. Now we know that preventing problems before they happen is one of the most powerful ideas to come along since the industrial revolution. In industry, it is the Total Quality way of working—and it is revitalizing American business.

Prevention means making sure that children start kindergarten healthy and curious—and that every day until graduating they go to school able and eager to learn.

Today, we're not doing that. Instead, we have left it to the schools to provide the services needed. That's an inviting way out, because schools are there and are organized; they are a large system, and students are readily reached in the school. But there are two overriding problems.

First, the schools don't have the resources. They are being told to provide health programs, day care, drug education, parental education, counseling for dropouts, AIDS instruction, and suicide prevention. These and many other programs are mandated by State and Federal legislation, and most are underfunded.

The president of a State teachers' union said, "What we used to call 'teaching' is now morning-to-night service to families. Some days it looks like nobody else is helping."

Schools simply don't have the human, physical, and financial resources for both the social and academic missions. Teachers now have so much extra responsibility that it cuts traditional teaching time in half. A study by the Minnesota Department of Education concluded that "the picture that emerges is one of crisis management."

In every school district I visited, administrators, teachers, and school boards are grappling with their social problems valiantly. But at the same time they are trying to reassure the community that they understand the challenge to the schools and that education is being improved.

This is denial and, I believe, a grave error in strategy. We cannot solve a problem unless we admit that we have it. The schools can't be faulted for dedication, effort or resourcefulness. But nobody likes to be the messenger of bad news, and the schools have failed to make the outside world understand the reality they have to deal with.

The second problem is that even the social support programs that are available are difficult for the schools to access.

A principal reason is that children's programs are currently scattered all over the government divided between Agriculture, Education and Health and Human Services. Within departments they are further distributed among agencies.

The same problem is reflected in many of the States. In Minnesota, Governor Arne Carlson identified 250 children's programs administered through 33 different State agencies.

To cope with the clutter and the confusion, the governor has created, for the first time, a Children's Cabinet consisting of the heads of all State government agencies that provide services for children. The Cabinet has inventoried all children's programs in the State and is now developing an integrated children's budget.

Now the governor has proposed the next step: creating a new department, the Minnesota Department of Children and Education Services. This State department will mean that other departments have to be changed and in some cases existing agencies will be abolished. However, as the governor has said, "We cannot let long-standing battles over turf and reverence for institutions stop us from taking meaningful steps for children and their families."

There is much the Federal Government can do, I believe, to untangle the administrative webs that make it difficult for communities to implement programs and make them hard to administer at the school district level. And I would ask that government leaders take the bully pulpit and pressure States and cities to simplify as well.

Unless we can coordinate services we offer to children and make delivery more direct, these services will not reach their full potential in improving education. A community program that works toward this objective is the New Vistas High School in Minneapolis. It was designed to coordinate the work of a number of agencies in order to bring social services to students directly, in their school, where they can be reached most efficiently.

Each of the students is a teenage mother, or about to become one. They take all the regular classes required for graduation, and in addition they receive the services that young mothers must have. The school also provides preschool to help their toddlers to get off to a good start, and we believe this school will help create a different life for two or three generations and more.

The school brings together the contribution of many collaborators. It occupies specially-designed space in the corporate headquarters of my company, Honeywell. We

also provided start-up funding and equipment. Instruction is provided by Minneapolis Public Schools. The United Way was responsible for coordination and communications. Childcare is funded by Hennepin County. On-site medical attention is supplied by Minneapolis Health Services. And on-site social workers are from Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

We think the school is making a real difference. Students are graduating, taking jobs or going on to colleges and vocational schools. We are about to start a school-and-business apprenticeship program we have developed along European lines.

Another Minnesota cooperative venture is designed to spread the collaboration philosophy of the New Vistas school. The program is named after its objective; we call it the Learning Readiness Initiative.

The goal of the program is to help communities coordinate services to reach children directly in their schools. The purpose is not to load up the schools again, but to facilitate services where they have not been available until now, and to help raise the funding required.

This venture involves the county, an agency called the Youth Coordinating Board, the Minneapolis Public Schools, one of the suburban school districts, the United Way, the City of Minneapolis, and Honeywell. Funding is also highly ecumenical. We have \$500,000 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, we raised \$600,000 from the private sector in the area, and Hennepin County awarded the program another \$400,000.

What we're trying to do with these programs is to make delivery of services simple and direct.

Our observation at this point is: Collaboration works.

Mr. Chairman, the essential point of my testimony is that it's time to coordinate all Federal programs designed to benefit children. Although Federal dollars are a relatively small percentage of the total we spend on children's services, these dollars pretty much force the structure in which all dollars are spent.

Each program enacted for education has its own mini-bureaucracy, its own regulations, objectives, and turf defenses. Beyond these are adjacent programs such as WIC, AFDC, Immunization and others which impact education.

A challenge to government agencies is administering these programs harmoniously—supporting each other, not competing among themselves. Independent action may suffice for cures—but prevention strategies demand collaboration.

For example, births to teenagers continue to increase—in 1989 they exceeded half a million. By some estimates teenage mothers may account for 20 percent of school dropouts. It is essential that this group be rescued. But in almost every State the problems of dropout mothers fall to the department of education, and the problems of their children fall to the department of human services.

Logic seems to follow the funding streams rather than common sense. A seasoned business person may suspect that a major part of the reason is turf protection.

Mr. Chairman, as you and this committee deliberate the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, one significant objective will be to cause our social expertise to become available to schools—so the schools can return to the job we demand they perform, teaching our children. Simplicity and coordination will help accomplish that.

They will help to make sure kids get the emotional, intellectual and physical support that develop curiosity and motivation. And these are the first requisites of a successful education.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee for the opportunity to speak at this hearing.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Our next witness will be Dr. Susan Fuhrman.

## **STATEMENT OF SUSAN FUHRMAN, DIRECTOR, CONSORTIUM FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION, EAGLETON INSTITUTE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY**

Dr. FUHRMAN. Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning. It's a pleasure to be here.

I would like to address the three questions that were posed to us in the order that we were given them. The first is, what is happening in school reform nationally? We're in an era of reform at the moment where many States and districts are working very hard to

create a more supportive policy environment for school improvement.

In an approach that many call systemic reform, they are working on three interrelated components. The first is to establish ambitious outcomes for all students. We all know schools that aim very high, but the system itself does not. At the moment, the system sends strong signals that we should focus on low-level skills. Everything about it, from tests that test isolated skills, to textbooks that water down content, to teachers who teach the way that they were taught in elementary and secondary education and in higher education.

Everything about it reinforces tradition and reinforces relatively low expectations. So the idea here is that the system would set very challenging outcomes and expect them of all students.

The second component is coordinated or coherent policies. Right now we have a very fragmented system. Many have mentioned it, Congressman Goodling and others on the panel. We have conflicting, contradictory policies. We have a project approach. Each problem is addressed with a separate program. We have the notion that we need a program a minute in education so that we can keep ourselves busy making policy at all levels of government.

The idea of coordinated policy is that we would use the ambitious outcomes, the standards, as an anchor, and we would integrate policies, particularly those dealing with student assessment, with teacher professional development, so the teachers are prepared to teach the content and skills we expect of students, with materials; the key instructional policies, but also, as we heard, thinking about coordinating social services and other areas of importance to education. But the notion is to anchor policies around the high standards and to focus on making them coherent.

The third component is restructuring governments. If higher levels of government, particularly States, are going to set ambitious expectations, then they need to free schools, give schools the maximum freedom in tailoring their programs to enable their students to reach those ambitious expectations. So policymakers are working on streamlining regulation, eliminating much traditional regulation of practice and process while they focus on establishing outcomes and on anchoring accountability to those outcomes.

This movement is very widespread. There are dozens of States involved, including those represented on the panel. Secretary Carroll spoke about Pennsylvania's movement toward performance expectations. National organizations are supporting the movement as well.

The second question is, what is the role of Federal categorical programs in this reform movement? I'm going to here begin to draw on the work of the Clinton-Gore Education Cluster Transition Task Force for K-12 Education—that's a mouthful—led by Marshall Smith and of which I was a member, and I, in my written testimony, acknowledge the names of the other members of the task force. So my statements about Federal programs will reflect that work as well as my own opinions.

I would like to make four points about the role of Federal categorical programs. The first is that special need programs in general, both Federal and State, are generally being left out of this cur-

rent reform movement in States and districts. That's an overstatement. I'm sure there are many exceptions. However, on the whole, the tendency is to leave these programs aside, to talk about building high expectations for the mainstream student and not even to involve in the conversation those experts in the needs of special students.

That's a tragedy. It's something that we must deal with right away. It's certainly meaningless to talk about systemic reform without involving children served by special need programs. That will neither be reform nor systemic if we do that.

The second point is that there are some specific requirements of Federal programs that directly contradict this new movement in States and districts. I believe there are fewer than the general perception, because I believe there is a lot of overinterpretation at each level of government of the actual Federal requirements, but there are some examples of direct conflicts.

The most talked about is Chapter 1 assessment. Placement and evaluation criteria for Chapter 1, requirements for Chapter 1, drive the use of norm-referenced standardized tests that focus on relatively low-level skills. As States and districts are trying to move away from that approach toward less frequent testing that is based on State curriculum standards and that may in fact only involve a sample of students, they are unable to use these new assessments. They don't fit with Chapter 1 requirements for frequent and norm-referenced testing.

And there is a direct conflict, because these two kinds of assessments send very different signals about what we would want students to achieve.

A third point is that the fragmentation of programs that we have been speaking about, the separate lines of accountability, the separate structures, the separate delivery systems, the implementation that is driven by fear of audit exceptions rather than a view of how programs fit together, this fragmentation inhibits school reform of the type that we see throughout the country right now.

Even the Federal school improvement programs are piecemeal and are not easily amenable to coordination. But certainly, also, the programs for special need students, the fragmentation of them counters this thrust toward developing a more coordinated and coherent policy environment for school improvement.

And the fourth point is that many Federal programs are different in orientation from the current reform movement. They are remedial and additive rather than preventive and post-school-based. They don't focus on quality; they focus on remediation, on making up skill deficits, and not on improving the overall quality of education.

What can be done? What changes might be helpful? Again, I would like to make four points. First, I would urge that we tie Federal programs to high standards, that we focus them on performance and not simply on serving children, but on the quality of children's education. We will have soon voluntary national standards in key subject areas. States are adopting their own standards. Many of them will use the national standards as a basis. These State standards should guide programs. We need to focus these programs on quality.



Second, we need to coordinate the programs. Everyone has made this point. We need to see where they are compatible and review them to assure that they can work together. I think tying many of them to the high standards will help achieve the purpose of coordination, as well.

Third, we need to build more flexibility into these programs. Districts should be able to coordinate funding from different sources, and we should encourage schoolwide programs, particularly in Chapter 1, so that schools can serve the needs of the whole child.

And, fourth, we need to build capacity. This would mean that we need to coordinate and refocus Federal technical assistance programs. Technical assistance right now focuses on compliance assistance. We need to focus technical assistance on quality. We need to coordinate it. We need to think hard about teacher professional development. I think these efforts need to be enhanced and again coordinated so that teachers are prepared to teach the content and skills we expect of students and they are prepared to help all children reach high standards.

I would urge that the committee consider the possibility of a basic reform bill, not unlike S. 2, that precedes ESEA and that helps States and localities build capacity for reform. Such an effort might give assistance to States and localities in building a supportive policy environment, in developing new assessments, in enhancing teacher professional development built around high standards, so that they are ready to take advantage of changes that I hope that we will see in ESEA toward higher standards.

There might also be a component that gives the Department of Education some discretionary ability to support particularly high leverage efforts, such as collaboratives of States working on the systemic reform agenda.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Susan Fuhrman follows:]

## Systemic School Reform and Federal Programs

Testimony of

Susan H. Fuhrman  
Professor of Education Policy  
and  
Director, Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)<sup>1</sup>  
Rutgers University

Before the  
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and  
Vocational Education  
Education and Labor Committee  
United States House of Representatives

February 4, 1993

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning. My testimony will address three questions:

1. What is happening nationally in the area of school reform?
2. How do federal categorical programs fit into reform efforts?
3. How should federal programs be changed to better support reform?

### Developments in Education Reform

Over the last two or three years, many states and districts have embarked on a reform strategy designed to provide system support for school-level improvement. Many observers call this strategy "systemic reform," and describe it as having three integral components: 1) the promotion of more ambitious student outcomes for all students; 2) integration of policy approaches and the actions of various policy institutions to promote such outcomes; and 3) restructuring of the governance system to support improved achievement.

**Promoting Ambitious Student Outcomes.** Systemic reform efforts have as their purpose enhancing student learning. Recognizing that some schools are successful in promoting ambitious notions of learning characterized by deep understanding of subject matter and sophisticated reasoning, reformers are seeking ways to encourage such outcomes for all schools and students. Everything about the current system, from textbooks that water down content, to standardized tests that focus on isolated skills, to teacher preparation programs that emphasize credit collection over deep understanding of content and pedagogy, reinforces low expectations. Unless high expectations are set for all students and reinforced with multiple policy levers, many schools will continue to emphasize low-level isolated facts and skills.

---

<sup>1</sup> These remarks are based in part on research conducted for the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), composed of Rutgers University, the University of Southern California, Harvard University, Michigan State University, Stanford University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison and funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The opinions expressed are mine alone and do not represent the participating institutions or the funding agencies.

How can policy promote ambitious outcomes if, as research suggests, instructional strategies and specific curriculum are best designed at the site level? A growing consensus locates the responsibility for setting ambitious outcome expectations and holding schools accountable for them with higher levels of government, such as the state. Then schools would be largely freed from other restrictions on practice, particularly process regulation, so they could design their own specific curricula and instructional strategies best suited to their students and communities. Systemic reform does not imply systemwide uniformity or radical centralization. Rather, systemic reform connotes attention to all parts of the system to promote higher performance.

**Coherent Policy Approaches.** If the role of policy is to encourage schools to meet ambitious outcome expectations, it is important that all policy to send consistent signals about those expectations. That is not the case now; our system is characterized by a lack of coherence. Policy fragmentation reflects our multi-level, fragmented governance structure; the high volume of education policy production at all levels, particularly in reform eras like the 1980s; and a tendency to address each problem with a distinct special program. These individual projects, no matter how uniquely worthy, seldom reinforce one another and frequently send different, even conflicting, messages to schools. For example, most current teacher certification and evaluation requirements stress generic skills and not ability to teach the subject matter content students must know. Programs for students with special needs pull them away from the mainstream curriculum, fragmenting not only their education, but the work of teachers and administrators. Staff development frequently consists of one-shot workshops on "hot" topics that are unrelated to each other or to the fundamental instructional and pedagogical issues teachers face daily.

Policy coherence around ambitious outcomes involves the integration of a number of key elements that provide guidance for instruction: standards for student learning; curriculum frameworks that guide schools in achieving the standards; instructional materials that are tied to the standards and frameworks; student assessments that measure knowledge of expected content; and teacher professional development that focuses on preparing teachers to teach the content and skills expected of students. Many policymakers are looking for ways to tie education finance to substantive policy goals. Right now fiscal concerns drive funding levels, and formulas distribute monies without regard to their use. Because we have lacked consensus on the goals we want to achieve and have not developed standards by which to judge quality, we have had no way of judging whether resources are adequate and appropriately deployed.

**Restructured Governance.** The design of coherent policy around ambitious outcomes requires attention to the roles of different actors within the system. Many leaders believe that the state should set broad goals and policies, but that schools should specify the details of curriculum and instruction. The main responsibility of the local district would be to provide resources and a supportive environment for the schools.

In order to enhance school-level discretion, policymakers are exploring ways to streamline regulation. Much reform discussion centers on anchoring accountability around outcomes; schools and districts would be accredited, rewarded and/or sanctioned based on student performance and other measures such as student attainment. Schools would have utmost flexibility in organization and delivery of instruction, so that they could maximize achievement on the outcomes in ways tailored to the needs of their own students. No longer would states regulate practice, such as class size or amount of instruction in various subjects.

**Extent of Systemic Reform Efforts.** Since the late 1980s, dozens of states as diverse as Arkansas, California, Arizona, Delaware, Vermont and Kentucky have undertaken reform efforts like those just described. State policymakers have been assisted by grants from national agencies like the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education and by support from numerous

organizations including the Business Roundtable, the Education Commission of the States, and the National Governors' Association.

State and local efforts to set outcomes and reinforce them with integrated instruments are only a portion of the movement toward upgraded instruction. Larger developments in the culture surround and support systemic reform, improving the destiny of policy approaches. For example, disciplinary associations, like the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), have begun to reach consensus on very challenging student outcomes. Spurred by the establishment of national education goals, voluntary national standards are being developed by professional associations in other subject areas. States are both borrowing from and contributing to national standards development; reform efforts at all levels of government are benefitting from professional and public participation. Surrounded by such broad, societal backing, policy efforts to establish and reinforce such outcomes take on increased authority.

### **The Role of Federal Programs in Reform<sup>2</sup>**

Four points can be made about the role of federal programs in these reform efforts. First, state reform efforts have done little to integrate special need programs. Second, policymakers complain that requirements of special need programs conflict with systemic reform thrusts. Third, federal programs can be said to typify the kind of fragmentation states are trying to overcome. Fourth, the remedial orientation of federal programs is not well-suited to the notion of common, high expectations for all.

At this early stage in systemic reform efforts, it seems that special need programs, traditionally called "categoricals," are largely left in place while reform efforts focus on the curriculum for mainstream students. This is not universally true. In 1991 the Minnesota legislature directed the disassembly and complete administrative and educational integration of special needs programming. This directive also included vocational education. However, discussions of systemic reform too rarely touch on how students with special problems may be educated under common standards. If systemic reform efforts bypass those students, including many in large cities where funding from categorical programs drives much of what happens in schools, they will be neither reforms nor systemic.

Some of the hesitancy about integrating special need programs reflects worry about federal requirements. I believe that many requirements are over-interpreted by states, districts and schools. Nonetheless, there are specific requirements that directly conflict with current efforts to upgrade instruction. Most notable is Chapter 1 assessment. Placement and evaluation requirements under the Chapter 1 program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act often compel districts to use basic skills tests which do not coordinate to the overall curricular objectives in many reform states and help perpetuate an unchallenging curriculum for these students. In California, districts administered the California Test of Basic Skills to identify students for Chapter 1 classrooms and to assess their progress over time. They could not use the tests aligned with the state curriculum which were administered only to a sample of students. California is now creating a new test tied to its frameworks which will be administered to every pupil; perhaps that might be used for Chapter 1 as well. But in the meantime, districts are relying more than ever on standardized basic skill exams.

---

<sup>2</sup> The next two sections draw on the work of the K-12 Task Force of the Clinton/Gore Education Cluster Transition Team. The K-12 Task Force, headed by Marshall Smith, included Anthony Alvarado, Scott Butterfield, William Demmert, Kenji Hakuta, Kenneth Melley, Robert Peterkin, Terry Peterson, Suzanne Ramos, Richard Ruiz, Shirley Sagawa, Janice Weinman and myself.

In addition, federal programs are a series of separate interventions, for different students or for different needs of the same student. Each program has its own approach, staffing pattern, delivery structure and accountability demands. There is no coherent view of how programs might fit together to help serve students and schools. For example, categorical programs such as Migrant, Native Indian, and Special Education tend to focus on identifying and regulating services to their target students rather than stimulating the general quality of all education programs which serve such populations. The implementation at the local and state levels of many of federal programs are driven primarily by fear of audit exceptions and compliance reviews at the expense of a focus on the needs of the whole child and coherence of teaching and learning. Even the programs designed to promote school improvement are piecemeal. Technical assistance activities and teacher training activities are small, unconnected to one another and not focused on a coherent view of improved instruction.

Finally, federal programs have a remedial, add-on rather than a preventative, whole-school approach to educating special need students. Children with special needs frequently receive basic skills instruction in segregated settings. Little is expected of them, and consequently, they do not have the same opportunity as other students. While systemic reforms stress challenging standards of achievement for everyone, children served by federal programs might not be included unless the programs are changed to facilitate attention to quality.

### **Changes in Federal Programs**

Four types of changes in federal programs would facilitate reform: tying programs to common, high standards expected of all children; coordinating across various programs; enhancing school-level flexibility in the use of funds; and building capacity for reform. While some programs might be consolidated where opportunities occur, these changes would not require collapsing programs. It is important to understand that the categorical structure—targeting special needs through individual programs—is a critical way to set federal priorities in education and should not be dismantled. However, the individual programs can be altered and improved to promote a common focus on high quality performance for needy students and, in that way, to be more effective for their target population.

The first change would require tying federal programs to high standards. Voluntary national standards will represent a shared vision of what students should know and be able to do. States can use the national standards as benchmarks in the development of their own curriculum frameworks and other standards. The standards could serve as a guide for all K-12 federal programs, by providing performance goals, by placing emphasis on improving teaching and learning for all students, and by setting high expectations for *all* children. They can help to guide the identification and dissemination of promising practices to teachers and school administrators. In this manner, a common set of objectives could forge new integration among previously discrete categorical programs. The standards also would make performance the primary emphasis of these programs and direct the provision of support toward the realization of these objectives.

A second change would focus on assuring coordination of various programs, using the voluntary, national standards as a unifying vision for the education of the whole child and all children. For example, programs for disabled children, language minority children, migrant children and at-risk children can be reviewed to assure that they work compatibly and in combination at each level of government, and especially at the school level.

A third change that is closely tied to coordination is the provision of greater flexibility in the use of funds. School districts should be able to coordinate funding from various, separate programs to create the best educational settings and practices for all children. In particular, LEAs should be able to relate Chapter 1 funds and funds from other programs, including Migrant education, Special

Education, Indian education and Bilingual education. Schools should also have flexibility to design schoolwide projects to improve the overall instructional program. In Chapter 1 there should be increased support for schoolwide projects. Chapter 2 and Title II can provide opportunities for schools to submit schoolwide plans that reflect the coordination of instructional practices, staff development, assessment and materials. At the same time schools and districts must be held accountable for providing all students the opportunity to meet the standards.

Finally, current federal programs of assistance and development can be refocused toward meeting high standards, and more resources can be devoted to building capacity for reform. For example, the federal government can expand, coordinate and focus its various professional development efforts so that teachers are prepared to teach the challenging content standards and to serve students as whole individuals rather than as recipients of specific services. Also critical to helping schools and school systems reach the national goals is the building of a national technical assistance capacity. Federal technical assistance must be shifted from a compliance focus to a quality support focus and coordinated across programs. The federal government could provide resources and work with states to build capacity for assisting schools and LEAs.

A key element of support for improved teaching and learning is the kind of policy structure described in the first section of this testimony. The federal government should, as part of its assistance efforts, support states and localities in developing coordinated and supportive policy infrastructures. In fact, the federal government should move swiftly to assist states and localities undertake systemic improvement in a basic reform bill, not unlike S2. This is important to build the necessary capacity for improved approaches to the education of special needs children that I hope will be reflected in ESEA. Support should be given to all states to help them develop supportive policy environments, including new assessments and professional development approaches focused on challenging notions of student learning, and the Department of Education should also be granted some discretionary money to fund particularly promising efforts that offer high leverage, such as collaboratives of states working together on elements of systemic reform. This fast track effort needs to be significant and lasting. It must carry enough money to provide a strong incentive to states and localities and last long enough to bridge the difficult developmental and sequencing issues that arise in this type of complicated reform.

## Conclusion

In summary, many states and districts are undertaking reforms centered around challenging expectations for what students know and are able to do. National standards development efforts complement these activities. At present, most reforms efforts exclude categorical programs. If federal programs are to encourage quality education for children served by categorical programs, they must connect to the larger efforts to upgrade instruction. Federal programs can focus more on performance and less on service provision; include efforts to coordinate across programs and divisions at each level of government; provide more flexibility to schools and districts in serving the whole child; and incorporate provisions to build capacity for reform. An important capacity building effort would be a basic reform bill that anticipates ESEA reauthorization by enhancing state and local ability to help all children reach high standards.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you, Dr. Fuhrman.

Our final testimony this morning will be given by Mr. Ernst.

**STATEMENT OF DON ERNST, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION POLICY,  
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR BAYH, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA**

Mr. ERNST. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

There was a little bit of *deja vu* for me this morning. I recall, when I was a schoolteacher back in Arkansas, I used a committee process, not unlike this, to engage students in current issues. And this is the first time that I've had an opportunity to come back to this kind of setting, except for my experiences in the statehouse. So I'm taken back to my years as a teacher today.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, and good morning. My name is Don Ernst. I'm the director of education policy for Governor Evan Bayh of Indiana. In addition to his strong interest in education issues in Indiana, the governor also serves on the National Education Goals Panel, the National Assessment Governing Board, and currently chairs the Education Commission of the States.

The governor today sends his greetings to you all, and he asked that I especially thank Congressman Tim Roemer for his help and leadership in education issues in our own State.

Congressman, I also thank you for that nice comment of opening. Thank you.

I appear before you today as a representative of my governor and on behalf of the National Governors Association. It is appropriate that hearings to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act began as the governors' 1993 winter meeting drew to a close. The theme of our meeting and the 1993 NGA agenda, "Strategic Investment of Choices for America's Future," lays out a broad program to drive the transformation of the educational system.

Led by Colorado Governor Roy Romer, the initiative builds on the work of eight previous NGA chairs, including former Governor and new President Clinton, who have made education a priority for the association. This consistent focus on education and children mirrors a gubernatorial concern felt in every statehouse in the Nation.

NGA's 1993 winter meeting also provided the governors with the opportunity to reaffirm with the President their commitment to achieving the six national education goals. The majority of current governors were not in office during the historic Charlottesville summit. However, new governors share the commitments made then.

Although improving the education system is a national imperative, the governors take seriously the State and local responsibility for education. Elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education constitutes the largest single item in State budgets. For this reason, responsibility for education reform falls primarily and squarely on the States.

Many States are actively engaged in trying to bring about the necessary changes while continuing to operate under the existing inadequate system. States also recognize the role that the Federal Government plays in supporting education. It is our hope that governors will be able to work closely with Congress to restructure

Federal programs in order to permit greater collaboration with State and local efforts to reform education.

The governors are pleased to share our experiences. We believe that understanding the dynamics of systemic reform—that Susan, I think, has eloquently laid out—at the State and local level, will help this committee strengthen Federal education programs.

The need for national performance goals for education emerge from the governors' belief that previous reform efforts had not achieved the dramatic outcomes they sought. Early reform efforts tinkered with the education system without fundamentally changing it. Reformers now conclude that a massive transformation of the entire educational system is required to produce a Nation of learners.

There appears to be a growing consensus on what needs to be done to create an education system that will support the Nation's expectations for higher student outcomes. Again, Susan alluded to these.

The first step is to establish higher outcome standards for students and educational systems. Other steps include the development of student performance assessments, or, in the current lingo, perhaps, authentic assessment, new curricula that are tied to the standards and professional preparation, and ongoing learning to prepare teachers and administrators to teach the new standards.

Leaders at the local, State, and Federal levels must acknowledge the complexity of fundamentally changing the way school districts and State agencies are organized. As the committee heard earlier this week, Kentucky is one of several States leading the way in reform efforts. With the opportunity to create their State education legislation from the ground up, Kentucky is the forerunner in implementing comprehensive reform. Other States have demonstrated other approaches to bring about major systemic reform. And indeed, in Indiana, we're about that business as well.

A review of State reports on the progress being made toward the national education goals indicates a wide variety of efforts and initiatives to restructure State education systems. States are also modifying their governing structures and encouraging school districts to do the same. In Indiana, we have created what we describe and really is an umbrella of innovation we call Discovery Schools. It is Governor Bayh's initiative to focus school reform where it really belongs, at the school level.

The idea is to waive those rules and regulations that are deemed onerous on the part of the educators at the local level and make sure that they are given high, rigorous standards to meet, and let them go about doing that. I could spend a lot of time sharing with you the excitement of a lot of educators at the local level doing this, and it's very exciting work indeed.

States have developed and adopted curriculum frameworks to build consensus around the issues of student performance; that is, what students should know and be able to do. The focus on student performance has led States to begin to develop new assessment systems—many of my colleagues here today have mentioned these—to provide better information for teachers, parents, and students on how well a student is doing.



The creation of multiagency task forces to oversee programs to address the concerns of children and their families has helped States coordinate the delivery of services to students and their families. Indeed, one of Governor Bayh's priorities is a program we call Step Ahead, which is community conversations about how Federal, State, and local governments can work together to more efficiently and successfully provide help for young children and their families, particularly those in greatest need.

What States have learned from their experiences so far. Although each State approaches systemic reform in its way, and I think that's appropriate, there is consensus around many of the elements essential to building a new system. At a 1992 NGA meeting on managing systemic education change, States shared information on some of their tougher challenges. Although efforts have been made to modify State practices to address these difficulties, it is our hope that the Federal programs may also be modified with these concerns in mind. Let me touch on a few.

Susan also mentioned this, capacity building, which I think is absolutely central to this discussion. System reform requires that teachers, administrators, and students take on very different roles and responsibilities than they currently do. And there's a lot of wonderful work going on across this country and our State that gives us some guidance for this. The goal here is to increase performance for all students—all students.

The system is challenged to build the capacity of people at all levels of the system to carry out their new roles and responsibilities. In essence, what I think we're talking about here is very meaningful, ongoing, professional development for those folks who are charged with caring about our kids at the school level.

Timing and sequencing. The real challenge is determining what step should come first. This is never easy. In addition, States must make clear the message about expected changes and ensure that the public support for such changes are in place before judgments are made about the progress and ultimate success of the effort. The issue of timing is further complicated by the conflicting messages sent by existing State and Federal regulations.

Recreating bureaucracy—that may be a non sequitur, I'm not sure. Implementing system reform requires a new balance between the State and local schools and districts. Left alone, most bureaucracies tend to reinvent themselves in their current form. However, it is much easier to articulate the goal of balancing top-down control with bottom-up authority and discretion.

Again, I would refer to Governor Bayh's efforts in Discovery Schools and thinking differently about how we connect the school-house with the statehouse.

Maintaining broad support. Maintaining support for systemic reform over the long term requires ongoing attention to creating ownership among educators and really engaging the public.

Part of Governor Bayh's initiative this year, as chairman of the Education Commission of the States, is really this issue; that is, how is it that political leaders can go about really ratcheting up, if you will, the engagement of ordinary citizens who obviously care deeply but, for a variety of reasons, rarely get engaged. Fundamental change does not come quickly and needs continuous support.

Continuous learning and adaption. All parties involved in system reform must expect to learn from their experiences to communicate this knowledge and to make changes as they go along. This requires a careful balance between maintaining the integrity of the entire effort and making reasonable mid-course adjustments.

How is it that the Federal education programs can be modified to support reform efforts? States have struggled to ensure that the messages sent by State education agencies consistently support reform efforts. It is our hope that Congress will take the same step in reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Based on NGA policy, we ask that the following considerations be given to align the Federal programs with State system reform efforts. Let me mention a few.

Continued support for the development of a national voluntary system of standards, and permit work on model assessment systems, to begin at the Federal level. We urge Congress to respect the standards and systems that States adopt and support governors' efforts to provide substantial discretion in designing and implementing new programs.

Support the State focus on schools. And I would argue this is very critical. Experience and thoughtful research justifies the State concentration on schoolwide improvement. Indeed, the school is the center of change. A Federal program should be designed to encourage States, districts, and schools to coordinate and integrate Federal programs to support reasonable schoolwide efforts.

Let us use Federal funds to back reasonable experimentation on the part of schools and districts, and enforce accountability, including clear penalties in cases of a sustained pattern of failure to improve student achievement.

Help us concentrate on the schools with the greatest need. Governors recognize that long-term poverty and low education achievement are linked. In schools with high proportions of students from poor families, everyone is less likely to achieve. Let us concentrate Federal funds on the education of these children.

Help us reward performance. Governors want to provide incentives to schools and districts that increase student achievement. Provide Federal funds for this purpose, but do not penalize high-performing schools by immediately withdrawing funds when they have improved.

Strengthen the Federal commitment to research and information collection and dissemination. The Federal Government plays a unique role in the collection and dissemination of education statistics and indications of student achievement. The Federal Government and the States must work toward a more coordinated information system.

Enhance the use of new technologies in the classroom. The Federal Government should coordinate its own efforts across departmental lines to support more research and demonstrations of the use of technologies, and it should share this information with States. There is a universe of alternatives here. Those of you who have seen any of the new educational technologies know that it is, in many ways, very magical.

Help States develop the capacity of our educational systems to meet the challenges posed by systemic reform. Provide incentives

for postsecondary institutions to develop new ways to educate teachers and help develop ongoing training systems for other school professionals. Provide the States with the flexibility to experiment with reform efforts. Give us the means to make the necessary mid-course corrections as we learn from our experiences.

Governors and Members of Congress share a strong commitment to improving the educational system in this Nation, and each has a different role to play in this effort. Our winter meeting provided us with the opportunity to begin a discussion as to how we can better coordinate State and Federal efforts toward achieving this goal. These discussions will continue during the coming weeks, and it is our hope that this hearing marks the beginning of a dialogue between States and the Federal Government on improving our system of education.

On behalf of the National Governors Association and Governor Evan Bayh, I would like to express my thanks and our thanks for the opportunity to testify, and I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Don Ernst follows:]

**Don Ernst  
Director of Education Policy  
State of Indiana**

**Background**

Good morning. My name is Don Ernst and I am the director of education policy for Indiana Governor Evan Bayh. In addition to his strong interest in education issues in Indiana, the Governor also serves on the National Education Goals Panel and the National Assessment Governing Board, and he currently chairs the Education Commission of the States. The Governor sends his greetings to you all. He asked that I especially thank Congressman Tim Roemer for his help and leadership in education issues in the state. I appear before you today as a representative of my Governor and on behalf of the National Governors' Association (NGA).

It is appropriate that hearings to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act began as the Governors' 1993 winter meeting drew to a close. Many of the issues Governors discussed during the meeting will be grappled with by the Committee during the reauthorization process. The theme of our meeting and the 1993 NGA agenda, "Strategic Investment: Tough Choices for America's Future," lays out a broad program to drive the transformation of the educational system. Led by Colorado Governor Roy Romer, this agenda builds on the Governors' long-term commitment to education reform, both collectively within the association and individually within each state. The Romer initiative builds on the work of eight previous NGA Chairs, including former Governor and new President Clinton, who have made education a priority for the association. This consistent focus on education and children mirrors a gubernatorial concern felt in every statehouse in the nation. Since the early 1980s, in state after state, Governors have placed the considerable prestige and leadership powers of their offices on the line to reform education at all levels.

NGA's 1993 winter meeting also provided the Governors' with the opportunity to reaffirm with the President their commitment to achieving the six national education goals. The goals are the cornerstone of many state reform efforts. The majority of current Governors were not in office during the historic Charlottesville summit. However, new Governors share the commitments made then. They support the bipartisan statement on the goals and the bold new consensus that these goals represent in laying out coherent national expectations for improvement at all levels of the educational system -- from preschool through life-long learning.

Although improving the education system is a national imperative, the Governors take seriously the state and local responsibility for education. Elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education constitutes the largest single item in state budgets. States establish the framework within which local districts and schools function. For these reasons, responsibility for education reform falls primarily to the states. Many states are actively engaged in trying to bring about the necessary changes. Each must try to create a new system while continuing to operate under the existing, inadequate system. Each is challenged to help educators and the public understand that higher expectations are needed and that teaching and learning must change in order to ensure that all students have an opportunity to learn.

The states also recognize the role that the federal government plays in supporting our educational systems. The multitude of federal programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act influence state and local education policies and practices. It is our hope that Governors will be able to work closely with Congress to restructure federal programs in order to permit greater collaboration with state and local efforts to reform education.

The Governors are pleased to share our experiences -- based on our individual and collective efforts -- in systemic reform. We believe that understanding the dynamics of systemic reform at the state and local level will help this committee strengthen federal education programs.

#### Changing State Education Systems to Meet the National Education Goals

The establishment of the six national education goals was a watershed event in education policymaking. The goals articulated the framework for an invigorated education system that engages all students, families, and communities in challenging learning environments. The need for national performance goals for education emerged from the Governors' belief that previous reform efforts had not achieved the dramatic outcomes they sought.

Early reform efforts tinkered with the education system without fundamentally changing it. Reforms attempted to change education from the top down by focusing on the inputs of education -- for example, promoting longer school days, or increased course requirements for graduation. Reformers now recognize that such an approach is not enough to change student outcomes significantly. They conclude that a massive transformation of the entire educational system is required to produce a nation of learners. At the heart of proposed reforms is the establishment of new and higher standards for what all learners should know and be able to do. The focus is clearly on improving learning opportunities for all students.

There appears to be a growing consensus on what needs to be done to create an education system that will support the nation's expectations for higher student outcomes. The first step is to establish higher outcome standards for students and educational systems. Other proposed changes include accurate assessments of student performance, new curricula that are tied to the standards and professional preparation, and ongoing learning to prepare teachers and administrators to teach to the new standards. Educators at the local level need the flexibility and authority to decide how they can best help students achieve the higher standards. In addition, all levels of the education system need to be aligned with other supporting systems provided by the state. Such efforts require leaders at the local, state, and federal levels to acknowledge the complexity of fundamentally changing the way school districts and state agencies are organized. Like a jigsaw puzzle, the multiple pieces and levels of the education system are interlocking and all affect one another.

As the committee heard earlier this week, Kentucky is one of several states leading the way in reform efforts. With the opportunity to create their state education legislation from the ground up, Kentucky is the forerunner in implementing comprehensive reform. This state's experiences have provided an unprecedented opportunity to learn about the progress and stumbling blocks in the early stages of implementing statewide systemic education reform.

A key feature of the Kentucky experience is the fact that it is both interconnected and comprehensive. Yet creating this kind of reform rests on the ability of the legislature to start from scratch -- or to at least be willing to undo current laws. Although such a comprehensive restructuring may

be more difficult for states without a court decision like Kentucky's, other states have demonstrated other approaches to bring about major systemic reform.

A review of state reports on the progress being made toward achieving the national education goals indicates a wide variety of efforts and initiatives to restructure state education systems.

Most states have formally endorsed the six national education goals, while others have adapted them or created new ones. Hawaii, for example, has supplemented the six goals with two state-specific goals that focus on governance and competency. New Jersey has adopted a seventh goal on parental involvement.

States also are modifying their governance structures and encouraging school districts to do the same. Vermont has restructured its state education agency to emphasize technical assistance as opposed to monitoring compliance with state regulations. Other states, such as Missouri, are proposing to recast the state education agency to work more closely with other human service agencies.

States such as California have developed and adopted curriculum frameworks to build consensus around the issues of student performance -- that is, what students should know and be able to do.

The focus on student performance has led states to begin to develop new assessment systems to provide better information for teachers, parents, and students on how well a student is doing.

The creation of multiagency task forces to oversee programs to address the concerns of children and their families has helped states coordinate the delivery of services to students and their families. This permits students to put aside some of their nonacademic concerns and focus on learning.

Finally, states are reaching out to communities, including local groups and businesses to build long-term support for the changes that will be brought about by systemic reform.

#### What States Have Learned From Their Experiences So Far

Although each state approaches systemic reform in its own way, there is consensus around many of the elements essential to building a new system. At a 1992 NGA meeting on managing systemic education change, states shared information on some of their tougher challenges. Although efforts have been made to modify state practices to address these difficulties, it is our hope that the federal programs may also be modified with these concerns in mind.

#### Capacity Building

Systemic reform requires that teachers, administrators, and students take on very different roles and responsibilities than they do currently. Because the goal is to increase performance for all students, the system is challenged to

build the capacity of people at all levels of the system to carry out their new roles and responsibilities.

Teachers need time to learn new ways of teaching, how to develop curriculum and activities that actively engage students, and how to develop new ways of gauging student progress. Administrators need a new vision of leadership that includes effective teamwork. These new and complex ways of teaching and leading cannot be taught through the packaged solutions offered by vendors or through a weekend training session.

We need to rethink how institutions of higher education prepare teachers and administrators and how ongoing support and professional development opportunities can be provided to school professionals.

### Timing and Sequencing

Ideally, all of the components should be put into place simultaneously. However, limited resources, delays in development of policies and practices and delays in actual implementation are facts of life.

For other states, the real challenge is determining what step should come first. In addition, states must make clear the message about expected changes and ensure that the public support for such changes are in place before judgments are made about the progress and ultimate success of the effort.

The issue of timing is further complicated by the conflicting messages sent by existing state and federal regulations. For example, although the call for a new approach to assessment systems is clear, many districts rely on standardized tests because they are the basis for eligibility and evaluation of many programs.

### Recreating Bureaucracy

Implementing systemic reform requires a new balance between the state and local schools and districts. Left alone, most bureaucracies tend to reinvent themselves in their current form. However, it is much easier to articulate the goal of balancing top-down control with bottom-up authority and discretion. For example, the message of trust and authority delegated to schools can be undermined by inspection and prescription by the state. The balancing act becomes even more complex when federal programs and regulations are added to the mix.

### Maintaining Broad Support

Maintaining support for systemic reform over the long-term requires ongoing attention to creating ownership among educators and engaging the public. Some states have found such support in the business community. Others have worked to educate the public about the pieces of such reforms. Still others have used systemic reform efforts to engage parents in the activities of their children's schools as a way of building ownership.

Continuous Learning and Adaption

All parties involved in systemic reform must expect to learn from their experiences, to communicate this new knowledge, and to make changes as they go along. This requires a careful balance between maintaining the integrity of the entire effort and making reasonable mid-course adjustments.

How the Federal Education Programs Can Be Modified to Support Reform Efforts

States have struggled to ensure that the messages sent by state education agencies consistently support reform efforts. It is our hope that Congress will take the same step in reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Based on NGA policy, we ask that the following considerations be given to align the federal programs with state systemic reform efforts:

- Continue support for the development of a national voluntary system of standards and permit work on model assessment systems to begin at the federal level. We urge Congress to respect the standards and systems that states adopt and support Governors' efforts to provide substantial discretion in designing and implementing programs to help all students meet the standards. Although federal funds are limited, this approach can be supported by ensuring additional support for disadvantaged students.
- Support the state focus on schools. Experience and research justifies the state concentration on school-level and schoolwide improvements. The federal programs should be designed to encourage states, districts, and schools to coordinate and integrate federal funds to support reasonable schoolwide efforts. Encourage state efforts to redesign the organization of schools for better performance. Let us use federal funds to back reasonable experimentation on the part of schools and districts, and enforce accountability, including clear penalties in cases of a sustained pattern of failure to improve student achievement.
- Help us concentrate on the schools with the greatest need. Governors recognize that long-term poverty and low education achievement are linked. In schools with high proportions of students from poor families, everyone is less likely to achieve. Large numbers of poor and low-achieving students do not receive any federal education support. Let us concentrate federal funds on the education of these children.
- Help us reward performance. Governors want to provide incentives to schools and districts that increase student achievement. Provide federal funds for this purpose but do not penalize high-performing schools by immediately withdrawing funds when they have improved. Work with states in providing low-achieving schools with technical assistance.
- Let parents be teachers. Governors recognize that there are things that parents can do -- indeed need to do -- for children to reach their potential. Let federal funds be used to encourage and enable



parents to support the work of the schools. Permit federal funds to be used to encourage collaboration with other programs and agencies that can support such work.

- **Strengthen the federal commitment to research and information collection and dissemination.** The federal government plays a unique role in the collection and dissemination of education statistics and indications of student achievement. This is especially true in the collection of data on a state-by-state basis. The federal government and the states must work toward a more coordinated system of information collection and dissemination. We have much to learn from each other.
- **Enhance the use of new technologies in the classroom.** The federal government should coordinate its own efforts across departmental lines to support more research and demonstrations of the use of technologies, and it should share this information with states.
- **Help states develop the capacity of our educational systems to meet the challenges posed by systemic reform.** Provide incentives for postsecondary institutions to develop new ways to educate teachers and other school personnel and help develop ongoing training systems for professionals currently in the schools.
- **Provide the states with the flexibility to experiment with reform efforts; give us the means to make the necessary midcourse corrections as we learn from our experiences.**

### Conclusion

Governors and members of Congress share a strong commitment to improving the educational system in this nation and each has a different role to play in this effort. As states, we will take seriously our responsibility to develop and implement innovative changes that will improve teaching and learning opportunities for all students. Our winter meeting provided us with the opportunity to begin a discussion as to how we can better coordinate state and federal efforts towards achieving this goal. These discussions will continue during the coming weeks.

It is our hope that this hearing marks the beginning of a dialogue between states and the federal government on improving our system of education. As mentioned earlier, the multiple pieces and levels of the system are interlocking and must be changed together to ensure a consistent message.

The task before you is a difficult one. The ESEA programs touch the lives of millions of students. We hope that you will draw on the experiences of states and the lessons we have learned in developing and implementing systemic reform plans. The Governors look forward to working with you during this important process.

On behalf of the NGA, I would like to express our thanks for the opportunity to testify. I'll be pleased to answer any questions that you have about my remarks.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Ernst. We appreciate your testimony very much.

I would like to say that I earlier recognized Mr. Goodling because he had to leave. And then I recognized Mr. Roemer because he was introducing one of the people testifying. I will happily accommodate those of you who have special requests. At this point, I would like to ask a couple of questions, and then I will allow the members to ask questions in the order in which you came in to the hearing this morning.

It has been suggested that the subcommittee consider clustering categoricals with similar characteristics at the Federal level and that State and local schools be given the authority to combine programs within clusters at the local level. What do you think of this proposal? I would like to hear from all four of you.

Secretary CARROLL. Within reason, it's an outstanding idea. It's the way the real world works in schools. We don't have a room for a certain Federal program and then move the kids to another room. I mean, it's a total environment. So I would recommend reasonable clustering, not only at the Federal level, because that will set the tone, but also at the State building level.

Ms. ENGLISH. Mr. Ernst.

Mr. ERNST. Very quickly. I think about one school in Indianapolis which has only recently begun processing medicaid, because they now have a pediatrician on staff three days a week. I'm not sure this is exactly what you're getting at, but what we find is that there is—it makes a lot of sense. And this is a school where about 80 percent of the kids are on free and reduced lunches.

I spoke with the principal when this happened last week, and she began to cry as she told me how happy she was that they now are going to be able to take care of some of the problems of these kids. So I think trying to create an atmosphere where there is some collaboration along a variety of issue areas sort of makes a lot of sense.

Ms. ENGLISH. Dr. Fuhrman.

Dr. FUHRMAN. I like the term "clustering," and I certainly like the idea of coordinating. I would not want us to be talking a lot about combining a lot of special need programs. I think that's neither necessary nor desirable. I think that the programs can be compatible without dismantling a structure that helps us set important priorities by identifying specific important special needs. So I like clustering, but I wouldn't want to see us dismantle a structure that identifies needs.

Ms. ENGLISH. Dr. Renier.

Dr. RENIER. Well, not being an educator, I'm going to have to go along with everything they have said. I would say just one thing, however. I do have a lot of experience with the education of teenage mothers. I think the idea of mainstreaming these young women is madness, and separating them from their children. And if clustering means educating the mom in the vicinity of the child and working on the entire family problem together, I'm all for it.

Ms. ENGLISH. Dr. Renier, keep the microphone for a moment. My next question really is a follow-up to some of your comments.

I'm intrigued by the New Vistas school program, and I'm wondering if there is a stigma attached to those students. When young

women go to that school, is there a stigma or some other detrimental social effect from having attended that institution.

Dr. RENIER. None whatsoever that I've been able to determine, or that the Minneapolis Public Schools has been able to determine, or the independent research institution that they chartered to study this thing in depth. And, in effect, we have a real waiting list of kids that want to get into the school.

We're doing much more than just dealing with the teenage mother phenomenon. We're now in the process of introducing the German apprenticeship system where Honeywell will hire these youngsters. And we have received waivers from Health and Human Services to make sure they don't lose their AFDC and health benefits.

On the contrary, their academic achievement is terrific. Some 80 percent are in community colleges and at the University of Minnesota. And it's a public school. We don't run the school. So it's not at all a stigma.

The only difficulty I have is with—and some of my friends have said, "You shouldn't be doing this for these young girls, because you're just encouraging more of them to get pregnant." And I won't comment on the mentality of those folks.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you for your comments.

I think we're running short on time, so I would like to recognize a few of our other members.

Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I'm going to follow up on the comment that was just made about the mentality of these other folks. I really appreciate your testimony, Dr. Renier, regarding challenges we face in comprehensive education.

But, as I listened to your testimony and as I read it, I thought, in all due respect, unless the business community is going to take the lead in educating the American public to the reality of the comprehensive response to the challenges facing today's youth, we in this Congress are going to be totally mired and, frankly, drowned in the, for lack of better terms, the attacks from the religious right about the schools getting involved in sex education, schools getting involved in condoning sexual activity and all that is entailed in that.

We can't respond to the social needs of the children in the political environment today unless business is going to get involved and explain to the American people why we have no choice. What can we do?

Dr. RENIER. Well, I can tell you what we have done, and, you know, we could be here all day talking about this. I agree with you that business has to come to the party far, far more seriously on the social side, not just the academic side, or the standards side, or anything like that, because, frankly, I don't think reform is going to work at all—there's all these wonderful things—unless the social agenda is addressed.

And it's self-serving to business to do so, because we're competing globally right now, and the social cost in the country is anywhere from \$600 billion to \$1 trillion a year. Eighty-two percent of the people that occupy Minnesota prisons are school dropouts. You

can go on and on. And all of that has to be wrapped up in the price of our product, and we have to compete internationally. And as this social activity continues to grow, or distress in the country, we, as a Nation, and we, as a business, we're going to become less and less and less competitive.

So it all makes a lot of sense. I agree with you that business has to come more to the party. Now it is; I'm very happy to say that. A large number of chief executive officers on the Business Round Table have gotten very, very involved in all of their States, on an individualistic basis, with each governor. That has been the work that they have done. There's not time to get into all the detail.

In my own State, we have 110 chief executive officers in the State that commissioned the study that led to the data that I've been talking about in the pilot models and activities that I described.

The real problem we have—and I guess I'll throw it back at you—is that, you know, if we have sick divisions in our companies, we have a real problem getting our company restructured unless we admit it. And the school system in the United States is broken, as far as business is concerned. But, you know, it's always the school down the street that has the problem, not the one we're talking about.

I have spoken to school boards. I have spoken to superintendents. I was just out in Colorado and spoke to school boards out there. And my admonition is, business will run air cover for you if you will just tell it like it is. The public does not know how bad the social situation is in these schools and what it's doing to the attainment of students. So it has to be a partnership, is what I'm saying. We can't just inform the American public. School superintendents and school boards all over the country have to admit that what they have is not optimum.

There is a major corporation in our State today that is stating publicly—I don't want to speak for them, so I won't name them, but they are an international corporation—they will no longer hire students from a certain segment of the Minnesota school system. But they are hiring students in Guadalajara and in other places around the world.

We feel this very, very deeply in business. That's why I'm here.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I appreciate deeply you're here, and I really am respectful of the fact and commend you for getting involved. But let me just give you two examples that we face here.

We tried last year to pass an education reform package through the Congress on a bipartisan basis. One of the areas where that bogged down is, the school boards demanded a total veto of whatever the community committee came up with as reform proposals. Now, not even a partnership where they had to work it out; they wanted a total veto of whatever reform proposal was suggested by somebody in their community. Mr. Goodling can go at this issue at length.

Let me give you another example on the social side. The greatest percent of increase in AIDS today is among teenagers, and yet the Department of Education does not and will not get involved in providing any kind of an AIDS education program, because it's too hot to handle.

Now, with those kinds of experiences for this committee, how, on God's green earth, do we get education reform?

Dr. RENIER. Well, I've described some education reform which is absolutely drastic, which doesn't cost any more than what we've been spending on education right now, and it works. You know, I have eight children. I have a bunch of them in private schools. My oldest is 40, and my youngest is 5. Okay. So school has been something of an infinity for me, you know.

And I called the headmaster of the upper school, because I wanted to be a principal of a middle school in Minneapolis, and I said, "How many teenage pregnancies have you got in your upper school?" He said, "What? We haven't had anything like that at least in seven years, and I can't even remember that." There's a waiting list of 200 in Minneapolis. And do you realize how difficult it is to deal with that phenomenon in a mainstream way?

You know, I think the schools no longer have an academic mission. They are social institutions that deliver an academic agenda. Yet the public doesn't realize that they're doing this on an ad hoc basis. And the social institutions that do exist don't support the schools very much, and so they have had no choice.

And the crime, I think, if you want to call it a crime, of much of us in the business community is, our first response was, teachers are lazy. That's what has happened here. We didn't know what's going on. No one has told us they have taken on this social agenda in the schools. But once you discover it, you become sensitive to the fact that teachers shouldn't be criticized; they should be canonized. They really should be.

But what they're attempting to do, they're attempting to pack into two years of efficiency time, if you want to call it that, what they used to do in four. And the rest of it is spent raising kids, chasing kids down. I really experienced this in the school I ran. I mean, I had one little seventh grader come up and ask me if I wanted to buy a Mercedes cheap, you know. I'm not kidding you. I mean, this is really something.

My first job every morning at that middle school, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade, in a suburb of Minneapolis, my first job was to walk the parking lot in search of pimps. This is a very serious thing. Society seems to want to deny what we've dumped on the school system, the public school system. And that, I think, all of us have to be extremely vocal about.

My problem is, I'm having a hard time getting the educators to bitch loudly about it, and that I don't understand.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I don't want to make this a dialogue between the two of us. Can any of the rest of you give us some help on this? I mean, I agree with what Dr. Renier is saying. I think the others of you have alluded to this in certain ways. We have to deal with the comprehensive realities of that student life. And yet I don't know how, in the political context, we pass a reauthorization that does that.

And I have to tell you, in the school context, we're going to deal with the social and the health needs of that student. You and I both know what happens. In 90 percent of the schools in this country, we ask the football coach to teach sex education, because we

don't know what else to do with him. And, I mean, no wonder the parents get upset.

So, I mean, it's a two-way street. We have a problem in the delivery system, but, boy, we have a bigger problem in the response that is needed here that we're not doing. Give us some help.

Mr. ERNST. Mr. Gunderson, in Indianapolis, there is an organization that is a business organization called Community Leaders Allied to Support Superior Schools. And the school that I referred to in Indianapolis that now has a dentist, a pediatrician, a full-time nurse, and Governor Bayh has also agreed to put two social workers in that school—I think, not all of the answer, but part of the answer is—and I think Dr. Carroll referred to it—is sort of working differently, different kinds of collaborations, particularly, different kinds of business-school collaborations.

This is a community where the business leaders have taken on the leadership of trying to support folk to work differently in schools. Again, that's just a tidbit of an answer, and I know that's not a thorough one, but one idea, perhaps.

Mr. GUNDERSON. But here's the problem. You all, in essence, have suggested that the basic delivery system, at the Federal level, that exists today, the categorical programs for the special populations, Chapter 1, Chapter 2, all continue. You and I both know, if business as usual comes out of this reauthorization, business as usual is also going to continue at the school level.

I mean, do we have the courage, on that side of the table and on this side of the table, to, frankly, throw all this out, not because it's bad, but because it's a black-and-white TV in an era of color, high-technology need.

Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CARROLL. Do we have the courage to do it? I think a lot of us are. I think a lot of us are putting up the same kind of stress and flack and attack that you are. And I don't know how you react to that, but I'm finding myself more and more getting tougher about it. It reminds me of Marine boot camp. I'm beginning to feel pretty good about hurting over this cause. So I think we do have the courage to do it.

I want to make a comment about information. I'm really surprised to hear that the social problems of the schools are not documented sufficiently and made available. We put out stuff that I don't want to put out, like dramatic increases in documented reports on child abuse, low birth weights. I mean, I'll exaggerate it, they look like Somalia. And we put that stuff out, because we don't believe that people will take us seriously or will solve any kinds of problems unless they know—I think people respond if they know.

So the answer is yes. On HIV/AIDS, we have it right in there. It's required. People don't like it. That's life. Now, we do have people, parents, who will have their children ill, miraculously, on days when they know that's going to be taught. Well, that's their choice. But at least it's there.

And this question of pregnancy, in Congressman Goodling's congressional district, there is a school district who has said repeatedly that they have never, in recent memory, had a pregnant teenager. Now, the only thing I can do is refer that to our Department of Environmental Resources. I want the water checked. I mean, this

is the kind of—so we do have different—we do have unopenness. But there are those who don't want people to know "these bad things."

I mean, we put out crime statistics, all of that, because I don't know how I'm going to get any help in solving these problems unless people like yourself understand what they are.

Dr. FUHRMAN. I think one of the issues with information is that the research and statistics and information effort is just as fragmented as the program effort. So we have lots of information coming out of different agencies at each level of government and, not until the national goals effort, an attempt to bring the relevant statistics together in the education framework, including all the social issues.

I would just add that there are many examples of the kinds of things that we heard about this morning in a number of States, family and health resource centers, in States as diverse as Kentucky and New Jersey, and many others. And it may be useful to hear more about how people are achieving that. And these are meaningful, not the coach phenomenon.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I have gone beyond my time. Go ahead.

Dr. RENIER. I just want to illustrate one thing, if you don't mind. This is just a recent paper, Minneapolis newspaper, I picked up when I was flying out here. There were 6,100 students—someone finally asked the students, "What do you think is the problem?" You ought to read this thing. It says, basically, the things that emerged were fundamentally the same, regardless of whether it's rural, et cetera.

Thousands of exasperated students describe what life is like with disruptive classmates. They told them how annoying it is when an entire class is punished for the behavior of a few, how discouraging it is when teachers appear unable or unwilling to be in control, and how cheated they feel. There was a 13-year-old who said the yelling, cursing, hitting, fighting, talking back—I experienced this in a middle school in a suburb. I couldn't believe it. There is bedlam, and there's no two ways about it. I admire these people who are trying to control this. But we have to understand that, if we want schools to carry this role along with the teaching role, then we're going to have to fund them to do it and charter them to get it done.

Mr. GUNDERSON. You are a distinguished panel, and I would like to leave you with some homework. You would all do me, and I think this committee, a big favor if, sometime over the next couple of weeks, you would sit down and put on paper what you think would be the ideal Federal role in your agenda, and not Chapter 1, Chapter 2, and all the categorical programs that exist today, but, based on what your mission is, as you articulated it to us this morning, what ought to be the Federal delivery structure.

Start from scratch, and I think it would be fascinating. We could break the boulder with that. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROEMER. [presiding] Before I recognize our very distinguished Chairman, let me first defer to our very distinguished ranking member for a quick question before he leaves. I think Mr. Goodling has discovered a good trick here. As soon as the Chair changes, he says that he has to leave so he can get a question in.

So, before I recognize Mr. Kildee, let me recognize Mr. Goodling very quickly.

Mr. GOODLING. Before you recognize Mr. Kildee?

Mr. ROEMER. I'm getting in deep trouble here.

Mr. GOODLING. Boy, you sure are.

The new Secretary of Education, I believe, is due in my office in 30 seconds, and I certainly shouldn't be late.

I just wanted to thank the panel and tell Dr. Renier that the reason Even Start got off to a better start than Head Start is because we said that parent participation meant that they will become more literate and they will learn more about parenting. And, unfortunately, we didn't start Head Start out that way. We said parent participation meant that somehow or other you were involved in curriculum development and all those kinds of wonderful things, but many parents were illiterate to start with and really couldn't perform those tasks. So I just pass that on. I was thinking, my wife believes that she is God's gift to teaching reading, and, from everything I can gather, she has been over the last 30 years. But she is about as frustrated as she can possibly be now, because this is first grade, and she has people who use four-letter words right and left, right to her face, and she can't do a thing about it. And she has this one on Ritalin. And, you know, she said, "That kid needs his back end fanned pretty good." And she can't do anything about that either.

And I'm afraid they're going to lose an awfully good teacher because—I don't know whether she can continue under these conditions—and these are first-graders we're talking about, in an affluent school district, no less, not center city or anything else.

I'm sorry I didn't get to hear Dr. Fuhrman's testimony, but I did get to read a portion of it, because you were saying a lot of things that are near and dear to my heart, and that's flexibility and coordination. I worry, too, about the number of Chapter 1 programs over the years that may have become more of a "Get that kid out of my classroom" kind of thing.

And we had originally thought that all of these programs were over and above everything else that every other student got. That was the original intention of Chapter 1. Some places, that's the way it is now, but some places that is not the way it works.

So I was glad to read your testimony; and, if you can convince enough members up here how important flexibility is, we will accomplish something we haven't been able to accomplish before.

Just one last note: Different people were talking about different ways to put the classroom together. And I mentioned yesterday—and I see another article here today—the notion of ungraded classrooms. Yesterday, we had an article of this new school system where classes are ungraded and where they have different age groups in the same classroom.

And I was sitting up here remembering back 55 years ago, that that's the way it was, as a matter of fact, and it worked very well. If you had an outstanding teacher in the one-room school with four grades, four or eight grades, it worked very well. If you had a poor teacher, of course, it was four years of mediocrity.

Excellence, I also noticed, Dr. Fuhrman, that you stressed in your testimony. And we've been trying to do that in all of the legis-



lation we have been passing the last couple of years, where the whole idea is quality. We need less emphasis on mere access, and more emphasis on quality. And I think you'll hear more of that as we go through additional legislative proposals. I think that's it. If it isn't access to excellence, then it's worthless.

Hopefully, even though we're just a small part of your operation, hopefully we can help promote excellence. And, if we can get parents to demand excellence, both of their children and of their schools, then we'll be on the right track.

Just one very quick question. Mr. Ernst, I noticed one of your bullets, "Help us concentrate on the schools with the greatest need. Governors recognize that long-term poverty and low education achievement are linked," et cetera, et cetera. My question is not to you. My question is to my superintendent, in relationship to that, because I have concerns about districts where there may be only one special education class or one person available, one staffer, to help Chapter 1 students, and so on.

And I just wondered if you would like to comment on "Help us concentrate on the schools with the greatest need. Governors recognize that long-term poverty and low education achievement are linked. In schools with high proportions of students from poor families, everyone is less likely to achieve," et cetera, et cetera. But if we shift too much in that direction, do you have any concerns about that, as far as Pennsylvania schools are concerned?

Secretary CARROLL. No, sir. Pennsylvania, by Census Bureau definition, is one of the most rural States in the Nation. The effect of that concentration would seriously deprive a large area, if you will, and substantial numbers of students from receiving help through these programs. I think it has to be done very cautiously.

In Pennsylvania, we have to worry about Philadelphia, but we also have to worry about what we call the T-zone along the northern tier and down through the middle of the State. Lots of folks dot those places with children who are eligible right now. And I would urge caution on the degree of concentration. I know there's a lot of pressure on that.

Von Klauswitz' principle of mass, well, if this is a war, then that's fine, but I think I'd be very cautious what I did.

Mr. GOODLING. If you put a school district together across the northern part of the State, you go 100 miles or more.

Secretary CARROLL. More bears than people up there.

Mr. GOODLING. I raised that question primarily because the lobbyist for Greater City Schools came in the door, and so I thought I would just mention that.

Secretary CARROLL. The answer is to triple the appropriation. That would take care of it. But that's not why we're here.

Mr. GOODLING. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. ROEMER. Now, before I never see this Chair or gavel again, let me recognize our very patient and capable leader on the committee.

Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. [presiding] Thank you very much.

Mr. GOODLING. He is an outstanding leader, I might add, as I leave.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you for taking the Chair. And, particularly, I want to thank Karan English, who got her baptism under fire here and did a very, very good job, my staff tells me, in starting the hearings.

Jolene and I belong to the whip organization, and, without announcement until this morning after we got there, the President and Vice President, for the first time in the history, I think, of the whip organization, came before us. A very, very significant meeting. And for both courtesy reasons and security reasons, one does not leave the room when the President and Vice President are there.

So I really appreciate, Karan, your filling in, and my staff said you did a remarkably good job.

I take these hearings most seriously because they are very, very important and very, very essential to the reauthorization. That's why I apologize for not being here, but I'm sure you understand the reasons.

I want to welcome all of you. You have all contributed very, very well.

I want to particularly welcome Dr. Renier, who—this is the third time that you have testified before me, and you have always been extremely helpful. I have great respect for you and for the organization that you serve so well. You have been doing some school work, too, recently, and I really appreciate that. You have been helpful in many areas of my concern. I appreciate that.

Let me just ask one question, if I may. In the hearing last Tuesday, three priorities for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act seemed to keep recurring among the witnesses. They were standards for student achievement, flexibility in Federal funding, especially tied to systemic reform and the coordination of health and other social service programs with education.

Would any of you care to comment on these suggested priorities, address them in the ESEA?

Dr. FUHRMAN. Yes. I think that we echoed the same things this morning. I think on the standards front we can think about high State standards as an anchor for a variety of programs, for children served under a variety of programs, and that our emphasis should be on the performance of children in educational programs toward high standards.

Flexibility would mean that districts could coordinate funding and that we would encourage schoolwide projects. I don't think, as I said in answer to a question before, that we need to dismantle our categorical structure, because I think it's important to set priorities for certain needs, but we can certainly work on making the programs more flexible, and amenable, and compatible to coordination.

On health and social services, I think that's critically important. You can do a lot in the ESEA, but I hope the effort would be broader, involving noneducation legislation as well, and that we could certainly cross agencies. I think, while there are a number of very encouraging State and local experiments, it would be really helpful to have a strong Federal example and a statement from the Federal Government about the importance of this.

Chairman KILDEE. I think more coordination is one of the areas of the President's interest too. I used to say, years ago, we should have at least one telephone line between HHS and the Department of Education. In the past very often there wasn't good communication. I think we need to show some examples here on the Federal level if we're going to encourage that coordination on the local level.

Let me ask you just one further question, if I may, Mr. Chairman. We have talked of standards for students. And last year this committee, in the Neighborhood School Improvement bill, wrestled with that. We felt that it was essential that we have school delivery standards also, standards to determine whether the student is failing or whether the school is failing.

Do you have any comments on delivery standards, anyone?

Dr. Renier.

Dr. RENIER. Yes. Only, I guess, someone who just doesn't understand things would say you don't have to have standards. But I'm very, very concerned about the way the word "standard" is used in the educational arena, especially in light of everything we have learned about quality management and doing things right the first time and all that sort of thing.

There are a lot of buzzwords. Outcome-based education is just a reincarnation of management by objective, really, and so many of these things. But the thing you learn when you try to fix something, in a production sense—and I do think that this science applies here—is that the process is what is critical. And the process and the reiteration and the improvement of the process is what allows you to achieve higher and higher standards.

There was some really good research done at the University of Michigan in which some of the best schools in Minnesota were matched against Taiwan, Japan, and, I think, China. And what I mean by this, to illustrate this, they can achieve a much higher standard there, not because someone set a higher standard necessarily, but they can do it because there are only three interruptions per hour in the classroom in Taiwan. There are five interruptions per hour in the classroom in Japan. And in Minneapolis, in two of our best schools, there were 32 interruptions per hour.

There's always a tendency to say, we only thought about input before, and now we have to go to outcome, but, let me tell you, none of this makes any sense any more than it does in a manufacturing production line, in terms of quality going to a customer, unless you fix the process.

So I don't know how you put that into your equation. Standards, to me, without an understanding of the process we're trying to improve, don't mean a lot to me. But as soon as you describe the process and you describe what you're trying to achieve with that process, then I can start to understand what some of these standards really mean and what behavior it should drive.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you.

Dr. Fuhrman.

Dr. FUHRMAN. I like to think of the term "standard" in the sense of the flag, the standard that you aim for rather than the standard that's a regulation. There are different meanings of the term. I

think that when we're talking about standards in education, we're talking about things we want to strive for.

"Delivery standards" are words being applied to a very essential concept, which is the idea of providing the opportunity to learn and making sure that students have the opportunity to learn what is expected of them, without—certainly not holding anyone accountable until the system makes sure the schools have sufficient resources.

I think there are certain essential resources that few would quarrel with. I think what we get into when we get into delivery standards is, we get into worry about traditional regulation, regulating practice, and we get into reiterating the whole set of the kinds of process regulations that we kind of want to move away from.

What we need to think hard about are criteria for rationing, to get down to a really parsimonious set of absolutely essential resources that we want to assure are provided. And we want to think of ways of making sure they are provided without resorting to traditional minimal standards regulation. And there are a variety of techniques we can use, but it is important to think about, what are those critical resources that will help guarantee the opportunity to learn?

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROEMER. [presiding] You are welcome, Mr. Chairman.

Before I take advantage of my position here and try to ask some questions, I'm going to recognize the distinguished member from California, who arrived here before I did.

Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to compliment Karan English. She ran a very good meeting. I had no idea she didn't know ahead of time that she was going to chair the meeting. And, I want to say that this shows once again the depth of the new, 1993 class—talk about talent.

Next, I want to make a comment, then ask a question. My platform for election stressed serving the need of the whole child in education; both for the child, and for the educator, so that we can provide our educators with students that can learn. You are helping me see the challenge ahead. It is a challenge, but it's a must. I've heard it from each one of the four of you and those that have come before you.

We have to look at the entire child, and we have to look at the entire system. We have to look at the child before that child is even conceived. We can't do it individually or with little turf battles.

Now, I do have a question. I have lots of questions, but this is one you can help me with today. I agree with the concept that providing child-by-child services can, and does, put a stigma on a poor child. Can we go school-by-school? That makes sense to me. Schools and districts that have a certain low-income population, would serve all students.

How can we do that without leaving out groups of children at schools that are better off but yet have pockets of poor families? Is it at all possible? Another side to that—is it possible to have programs for every school and have prorated fees for meals; medical/health services; and child care, so that every school offers a menu,

and those that are very needy get that for free; the more you have, the more you pay?

Secretary CARROLL. I'll take a crack at it. First, if you can accept the notion that, for a lot of children, the school building is characteristic of the individual child that now gets the help, and, therefore, what you do to eliminate stigma is simply say everyone is eligible for everything.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right.

Secretary CARROLL. Okay. Take that aside, that may be 30 percent, say, of the schools, and usually characterized by urban or rural poor, if you will.

Now, what do we do about the others? Well, I think you go back and start looking at programs like the Food and Nutrition Program. You can't tell when one of our poor kids goes through a cafeteria line what they are. You have done that, by the way, because you set rules that say, "Schools, figure out how to do it." And it was amazing. Everyone told me it would be impossible to do. Within about 3 weeks, it was done. So, you know, you can challenge us a little bit to do some of these creative things.

For special programs, remedial reading, or whatever it is, if we do that—and I'm not arguing that's what we do now—I just think we make kids who are eligible for that—eligible, that's not a whole school—but we simply use the services we have.

The more you break down the categorical aid notion, the better off you're going to be on stigmatizing kids. And we have so many examples. I think we can do it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. What about on-site child care?

Secretary CARROLL. Well, as a State who has a lot of that, and we have high school mothers who bring their children to school—amazingly enough, they even ride the school bus without too much problem. There are rooms where people help to take care of the child, but the mother must come down, and the father, as we continue to track the rascals down. Other kids know who the fathers are, so you can do some things there.

You get both the mother and father in those rooms during study halls or during lunch opportunities, they're feeding the kids and what have you, guess what, it works.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, those are student parents, but what about working parents?

Secretary CARROLL. You're thinking of after school or before school?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Before and after school.

Secretary CARROLL. Well, I think latch-key type programs are in such abundance in our State, from a variety of sources, that we haven't pushed it with schools, because when schools have tried it, they generally don't have enough kids to take advantage of it. There are private and other things. People do a lot of worksite day care that runs through their working hours.

So we have not found that—we thought it was a great idea, started promoting it, we couldn't find the takers, if you will. That may not be true in every State.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you.

Mr. ROEMER. I guess I get to ask a couple questions now.

Mr. Chairman, is that all right?

Chairman KILDEE. Yes.

Mr. ROEMER. All right. Let me just take the discussion, hopefully, a little bit further and maybe out of the confines of this hearing room for a second, and get you to think in different terms.

I recently visited Chicago inner city schools. We used to have a member of the congressional delegation from Chicago here on this committee. And, as Don knows, I visit Indiana schools every time I'm home in the district. When I visited the Chicago inner city schools, we see problems there that, as Jonathan Kozol said, are savage inequalities, in terms of what is happening in our inner city schools, and the hopes and the fears of these kids, and, as you eloquently testified, the problems that they bring to school before they even walk through the door.

The school kids where I visited tested in the bottom percent in testing scores. We saw full-time police officers in the schools. We saw graffiti and gangs. Children had to go to school, not based upon their qualifications or choice for a magnet school, but on the color of their building in Cabrini Green. The gangs determined where they went to school.

Now, we all are horrified by situations, when we see hunger-related disease in Somalia and the rape situation in Bosnia. I think we should be equally as outraged by what is going on in our schools and what is happening to these people that are losing their entire futures. And we're losing them. We're not just seeing this happen to human beings and children, but, if we want to look at it more selfishly, we look at what is happening to the tax base, what is happening with the budget problems that we face in our schools.

So let me start with Susan, if I could, because, Susan, maybe you're not in a political position. You have less to lose by being a little bit more radical in talking about some reforms. Let me just say, very politely, that I disagree with one thing that you said in your statement about S. 2. I think we need to go a lot further than S. 2, in terms of reforms and new changes, going into the 21st century.

Can you give me some more ideas as to what we might do, apart from what was in your testimony, to kind of rethink the kind of change we need here?

Dr. FUHRMAN. I guess the way that I would begin to answer the question is to think about the comparative advantage of the Federal Government and what kind of leverage it can exert, I mean, when it contributes, what, between 6 percent, hopefully more, up to 9 percent, something like that, of the funding.

I think that, when there are promising reform efforts going on around the country, as there are now, the best thing the Federal Government can do is to help support them and to help places with the capacity to work on them. That doesn't mean, by any means, ignoring the traditional role of access and programming for special needs children and at-risk children. I think that should be enhanced in many of the ways that I spoke about in my testimony.

But, beyond that, where there are promising efforts to collaborate social services and to deal with the whole needs of the child, the Federal Government can help support them. Where there are States and districts working on really hard, difficult, challenging

reform efforts, as there are many in this country, the Federal Government can help support it.

Now, what I think especially needs to be thought of in the Federal Government's role is that it can't always support everything everywhere. It's impossible to do that. So what I would urge is that, anytime we support a subset of places, be they pilots, demonstrations, or whatever, we really make an effort to learn from them. We don't do that systematically, in a way that can inform other efforts. That's something the Federal Government can do better than anybody else, given its breadth of scope.

So we can learn about how—not in sort of a narrow evaluation format, is this program working in this context, but is this program a good strategy, and how could it be applied elsewhere, and what did we learn about how it's working that can be applied elsewhere? So I would certainly urge that approach.

I would think that the Federal Government is also important in terms of setting an example. Everything about its programs can be viewed with what kind of example and what kind of incentive mechanisms do we present to the State? Do we provide opportunities for coordination, and do we encourage that? Do we provide the right incentives, and do we model the right incentives that States and localities can use?

So I would think one way of approaching the broader question is to look at the leverage. In each possible case, what's the leverage? What kind of example? What can we learn from it? What kind of incentives do we send?

Mr. ROEMER. Let me ask Don, if I could. Don, in terms of in-service training for teachers, I know that's something that you and Governor Bayh have been working on, how do we leverage these kinds of in-service training programs for our teachers? Too often we see that cut right away. We get great, brand-new ideas, and then we don't allow the teachers the time to deal with these new curriculums and new ideas.

How do we do some of the things that Susan has just recommended with pilot demonstration programs, leveraging funds to encourage our State to take these steps in in-service training programs?

Mr. ERNST. Congressman, it's a right-on question. It's a essential question. I certainly don't claim to have all the answers about that, but what I have learned in the last two years has come from a lot of the educators who are working in our Innovative Schools Program. And what we found is that what is critical is that the State provide them with a couple of things, and maybe there are some lessons to be learned here for the Federal level as well.

One is, some flexibility in terms of time. What do I mean by that? Well, historically, in our State, there has been a rather—what I would describe as pretty rigorous requirements for—indeed, up to minute requirements in particular subject areas. Our State board, with Governor Bayh's leadership, has moved away from that and provided some waivers so that teachers begin to determine how much time they need to spend doing particular things.

So some waivers away from some of the rules and regulations that might inhibit teachers, to have the time to reflect, to think, to worry about school change issues.

The other thing that we found is that it does take some money. It takes some resources, and not a lot sometimes. In our Innovative Schools Program we have funded some R&D efforts of small grants of up to \$25,000 for use for whatever purposes the educators describe as meaningful to them; in other words, a little bit of money and the programs designed by teachers themselves for their own meaningful purposes.

I guess the other thing I would say, and I think that we're still learning about this, is that we have to think differently about how folks collaborate and how they work together—I think we have tried to—all of us have said that in one way or another—things as complicated, perhaps, as figuring out ways to work differently inside the school with colleagues, and things maybe as simple as teachers having the freedom to travel from one State to another, or from one school to another, or maybe from one classroom to another.

So I think it's sort of breaking, if you will, the regularities of schooling. But I think there's another thing. I think it's a bully pulpit, if you will, particularly from governors, maybe even other school leaders, who say, you know, what's really important here is that we provide professionals with an opportunity to grow, to learn about the kinds of problems that we've all worried about here today.

And, finally, I guess what I would say is, you know, we've done something kind of crazy in this enterprise. We have, for a long time, separated the notion of student development from teacher development. I think those are hand-in-hand. Until we recognize that there is a relationship between helping teachers feel good about themselves and their work, that's going to be translated to the schools.

So working differently, thinking differently, working collaboratively, a little bit of money, and maybe some freedom.

MR. ROEMER. One last question so I can recognize other members.

Dr. Renier, let me join with the Chairman in associating with those remarks that he made. Last year, when you testified, you testified about many of these same things. And I didn't get the opportunity to ask you this question.

We all talk about prevention and leveraging money up in the beginning stages of education, and your testimony has centered around that. How do we encourage our businesses directly to do that same thing in their involvement in the schools? They are spending, roughly, according to the IBM vice president, businesses in this country are spending about \$30 billion recreating schools in the workplace. Not that they not do that, but how can we get them to leverage some of those funds up front to help with apprenticeship and intern programs and school-to-work programs?

Dr. RENIER. The whole question of apprenticeship programs is really coming to the fore now, and I think business is going to get very, very involved in it. There's a lot of activity, and the activity I'm aware of right now is based upon the German model, which basically says that corporations would hire these folks and teach them the vocational-technical stuff, with the help of the vocational-technical schools, but on the job.



And what you can do for a lot of those folks—let me give you an example of a problem that I've run into in trying to put this into the teen mothers' school. My first response from the teen mothers was great enthusiasm about this kind of an arrangement. The ones that didn't want to go to college could spend, you know, four years with us, on our payroll, or with Health Span, the third largest employer in the State, that needs OR technicians, that needs lab technicians, and would like to offer opportunities to the kids and hire them.

But we ran into a number of problems. One of the first problems was, for the teen mothers, that if they did this, they would lose—and get money from the company for working—they would lose their health benefits and AFDC. Well, they weren't about to do that. And we have lobbied hard with Health and Human Services, and I think I said earlier, we have gotten waivers for our school.

But, now, I think you had better take a look at that, because, as apprenticeship programs are going to develop, as I said they will, there is going to be more of a clash between welfare policy and what you're trying to accomplish, and the one is going to defeat the other. I'm concerned about that. If you go for waivers every time you want to do something like this, I think we have a real problem.

This system is going to work very, very well, because the public school system is most anxious to provide a future and an outlook and a career for, they consider, about half of their students that really aren't interested in going to college. And all of us in industry are very enthused. We talked about it at the Business Round Table meeting last night. I think you're going to see a real welling up of that sort of thing.

So I think what you desire is going to happen.

Mr. ROEMER. Good. Thank you again, everybody.

I would like to recognize the distinguished member, Mr. Green.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity.

I guess a lot of us that are freshmen, we bring a lot of different experiences to the committee and the subcommittee. I was part of the first wave of education reform in 1984 in Texas, and we lost a governor because of that. No pass; no play. And when you mess with football in Texas, you mess with everything, I guess, and also the teacher testing. It was two major issues, but a number of us did survive opponents, with the coaches out working against us. And this comes from a person who did play football in high school.

The second wave, I guess, when I moved to the senate, I served on the Education Committee. And the system reform that you talk about, it seems like the more we see reform, the more we're getting back to what was pre-1984 and, at least in Texas, and maybe nationally, before our crisis mode. I think we're finally getting to the point where we know where everybody wants to be or we want them to be. Now we don't care how you get there. And I don't see a problem with that.

I think a lot of States have done that, and we're continuing to do it, because, again, you don't just reform in 1984 or 1989, it's a continuing process.

One of the questions I had, though, in discussing your testimony today with staff, was—I have a number of questions, like a lot of

other members, but because of time—when we consolidate or cluster programs—and, as a legislator, I had to deal with this. Let's be sure that we don't dilute those specialized services for these special needs children, whether they be special education bilingual, or whatever.

But, for example, if you have two or more programs that are clustered, will the students affected see any difference in these programs? And I've been in the schools. In fact, like our ranking minority member, my wife teaches in a high school that's a triethnic high school in Houston. And we've seen the problem of categorizing students because of Federal programs, but we also don't want to lose that emphasis on those particular programs that those students need that funding and that special attention for, by that clustering.

I guess, it would be directed to the education commissioners to see how we can do that on a State level. For management purposes, it needs to be done, but can we still do that without losing the emphasis on those particular special needs children?

Secretary CARROLL. Well, as far as special education is concerned, let me be as direct as I can. With the small amount of money that comes to the States from the Federal Government, and with the fact that—and, for example, in our State, we are this year putting \$600 million into special education—I guarantee you're not going to see it lost, simply because our State law and State funding will protect it.

Now, if you start giving us \$600 million to match our \$600 million, we will have a tremendous partnership trying to work it out. I think it's the right thing, and most people will do the right thing. You might be able to build in some protections, but I don't see people—if the programs are clustered, they will use the money more efficiently. They will serve the kids. And I wouldn't, at this stage and for a long time, be frightened by that.

Mr. GREEN. And I recognize, again, I'm wearing a different hat, because I've talked about the same issues for years in the legislature. We just complied with the Federal requirements, and we paid for them. And, in fact, before I left the State senate, my lieutenant governor said, "Don't send me any mandates when you go to Washington." And I said, "Well, Governor, that's what my local school board said to me for seven years as a State senator, and it didn't stop us, the State legislators, from doing it."

Thank you.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Green.

Mr. Strickland.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I've been sitting here thinking of a quote that has a lot of wisdom in it, and I can't quote it verbatim, but it goes something like this: For every difficult, complex problem, there's a simple, easy, wrong solution. And extending all due respect to my colleague on the other side, if a four-year-old comes to school and is using four-letter words and is out of control, I think the last thing that four-year-old needs is a swat on the bottom.

I was kind of struck by that, because I have been concerned for a long time that we don't stress readiness like we ought to, and we do spend so much of our time and effort and money trying to remediate problems, rather than recognize them at an appropriate,

early time in a child's life and provide appropriate intervention so that problems do not arise.

And I would like comments from any of you who would like to comment on this. What do you think about what we're doing as far as early screening is concerned, identifying children who are most at risk of school failure and providing appropriate intervention at a time when it is probably going to be most helpful, perhaps least costly, and most effective?

Dr. RENIER. Well, I don't know if you heard about an initiative called "Success by Six," which was a United Way initiative which we now have, which is mainly a creature of the private sector. We now have over 50 such programs now in the United States, in a lot of major cities, and growing. One of the major tenets of that is getting kids ready for school, and not enough attention is paid to that. And you have to start, as someone earlier said, prior to conception and work the problem all the way through.

I am happy to report, we're really making some advances in our city, in this particular program, joint with the mayor's program. We've called the entire program "Way to Grow," in which corporations, hospitals, and public bureaucracies have banded together, carved up the city, and are going after this prenatal care issue with a vengeance, because we really feel that this is terribly important.

You know, as a businessman, you deal with utilities, for example, and if you find ways to save energy, you can get a rebate from the utility, because they don't have to go out then and borrow the capital to build more plants. And it's a good deal for everybody. Why isn't the same philosophy applied? Because, you know, children's hospitals besiege a company like mine for contributions to build new wings for intensive care wards. It seems to me you can save a lot of that capital with a very meaningful prenatal care program.

You're right on the mark, and I really think that we're demonstrating that. We have about six neighborhoods now assigned to various collaboratives. And in the neighborhood that we've had the most experience with—we're having it evaluated now—but it looks like we've cut the infant mortality rate in half. That makes a big difference. And then, if you consider the cost of taking care of these preemies, it ranges from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000 each. I mean, this is big-time stuff.

I would say there's not enough attention paid to this. The Committee for Economic Development, two of their studies demonstrated aptly that we weren't practicing prevention sufficiently, pointed out that the infant mortality rate in the United States is something like 17th in the Western world, which is foolish for the kind of technology we have, roughly equivalent to what it is in Sri Lanka. And we have been content to sit on that.

And kids do come to school—someone mentioned Chicago—some of them, I've been told, in Chicago, frankly, don't know their last name. Incidentally, I think I'm right, the last time I was in Indianapolis, they were talking about weapon detector systems in the schools in the inner city there.

I mean, this whole thing is very, very serious, and it's serious to our international competitiveness. I want to come here as a self-serving, grubby businessman today and to tell you that, if we don't solve these social and educational problems, this country isn't

going to have any industry before it's over with. And that's—you know, you've sent me to the moon on this one. Okay. Thank you.

Secretary CARROLL. May I make a comment? It's hard, when you're on the moon, to follow up on that. But the dilemma you face is clear: You are dealing right now with a remedial program. Now, to remediate, someone has to start and fail to learn. Then we know who the rascals are, and we can try to remediate using this program.

My suggestion is that, for most of the kids, the predisposition to need remediation starts long before they get to us. And if you really care about remediation, stop the need for it, and use the resources of this particular program to start to deal earlier with young people, because you're never going to get—you're in a Catch 22.

We kind of like it, but it's no secret where most of the kids are in Chapter 1 programs. Very few 12th grade kids are in this program, and very few kindergartners are in this programs, but there are an awful lot of upper elementary, middle and upper elementary kids in the program, because then, for the first time, we know that they need remediation. But we shouldn't want to know that. We should prevent it.

So you have a chance to dip earlier. And, by the way, there is some behavioral stuff that can go on—and I'm not a big—Lord knows the battles I'm in in Pennsylvania on this—I don't want this out. I'm not into reassigning all the values of kids or anything else, but, by golly, they shouldn't carry guns to school, and they shouldn't hit people over the head, and they shouldn't do all those things. And they can be taught something about that, but you have to start very young.

When Congressman Goodling talked about that first grader, that's probably what happens, probably worse than that. That's preventable.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I guess I would say that perhaps the parents of that child need a swat on the bottom.

Secretary CARROLL. That's if you can find the parents.

Mr. STRICKLAND. That's right. You're dealing with an anti-corporal punishment person, so you and I kind of agree on that.

Dr. RENIER. You know, 56 percent of the kids in the Minneapolis school system are from single-parent families. In many cases, you know, it's just very, very difficult to ever even find them.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, just one other thing.

I believe we're probably going to have to set priorities and make decisions. And if I could just get my two cents worth in here, that I think we ought to think of those ways in which the dollars we spend are going to be most effective.

And I come back to the early prevention/readiness programs, because I think, if we—I keep going back to my profession. But, as a psychologist, I kind of buy into Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. And if you're hungry, you're not going to think about learning. And if you're afraid you're not psychologically or physically safe, you're not going to think about learning.

I think we need to get very basic in the setting of our priorities and how we're going to expend our funds and so on. That's my particular bias.

Mr. ERNST. Mr. Chairman, just a quick comment. I think this issue is very important to the governors, and I don't think it's any accident that the first goal, the first national goal, has to do with preparing kids to be ready for school.

Dr. RENIER. May I add something to that? It isn't very expensive a lot of times, either, to fix some of these things. In the teen mothers school, we discovered that—the public school system insisted on starting school at 7:20 in the morning. It doesn't cost you anything to let the kids start at 9:30, and you cut the dropout rate in half.

The other thing is that one of the main mechanisms for teenage pregnancy has nothing to do with young boys. It is the boyfriend of the single mother who molests the youngster when she comes from school too early. So if you start school later in the day, you protect the youngster, because her mother is home. And these things don't cost anything.

There are a lot of people who are just willing to sit with the status quo in this area. We really have to help the system change in this regard.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Strickland.

Let me recognize now, appropriately, somebody very interested in the readiness programs and getting children ready to learn, and who has more seniority on this committee than I do.

Mrs. Unsoeld.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Renier, it's great to see you in fighting trim. I'm hoping that your presence here today means that I can start meddling in your life, and in your schedule. There is no one in this country who could detain me from coming to pay homage to you except the President of the United States, and, unfortunately, that's what happened today.

It is just because you can be—how did you describe yourself—a grumpy and, I would say, successful CEO that you are such a powerful spokesperson for these issues, without parallel in this country. And that's why I want to meddle.

But short of cloning you, not every community has a Dr. Renier to stir things up. And I have found it very inefficient for me—I bought 100 copies of *The Unfinished Agenda*, and I'm so glad to see there are more here I can steal today, because I'm down to about 2 copies. And that's not a fast enough way to change what needs to be changed now.

In your testimony I read the calling for coordination and integration, which I share with you as being so important. As an outcome of the L.A. riots, it seemed to me that there's another factor that we have talked about in our previous sharings together. Not only is early childhood education important, but so is the development of a conscience. We have a generation that has come of age, many of whom have come from families so dysfunctional that there is no sense of remorse when pain is caused or violent death occurs.

But have you had a meeting yet with Secretary Riley?

Dr. RENIER. No.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Have you met with Secretary Shalala?

Dr. RENIER. No. Well, I know Donna Shalala very well, because she worked on the CED reports with me. And I have not had the pleasure of meeting the Governor. I have, obviously, worked very

closely with Lamar Alexander, and David Kearns, and all of these other folks.

Mrs. UNSOELD. And Secretary Reich, have you met with him?

Dr. RENIER. I don't know him. I know who he is, obviously.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Have you met with the President, or the First Lady, or Mrs. Gore?

Dr. RENIER. No. Incidentally, I could use you when I get home to help me with my wife, with wonderful——

Mrs. UNSOELD. Well, I would like to impose on the good offices of the Chairmen of this committee and subcommittee to try to set up some meetings with those folks, so that we can integrate and coordinate an approach that I feel you are such a vital spokesman for.

Dr. RENIER. And I will really take you up on that, if the opportunity presents itself, because yesterday I agreed to take on the role of a national initiative for the United Way of America called "Mobilization for America's Children," which deals with all these issues and brings the private sector in. Because, you know, this is an institution that is an instrument of the private sector, and I'm going to need government help.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Okay.

Dr. RENIER. That's like asking for the order now.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Okay. Well, my staff member, wave your hand over there—Dr. Karen Anderson, who is a science fellow I have the opportunity of sharing this year, and I want to talk with you and your staff afterwards.

But I will ask one question about your Success by Six program. Why do you think it's so effective? What is the key idea that we can transport?

Dr. RENIER. Because with such a small effort you get such a tremendous return. This is what tickles the business people. Business people, generally, have not been too pleased with the manner in which tax money has been spent and the return they have gotten for it. In our State, over the last 10 years, the education budget has been enormously increased, and the scores continue to go down. And they are saying, you know, "No more good money after bad. We need something different."

In the case of Success by Six, which is a program whose objective is to eliminate barriers in the system that are raised that prevent little ones from becoming school-ready, it's exactly the thing you're talking about. It's a collaborative between industry, the United Way, and the public sector, in which a completely nonbureaucratic, entrepreneurial approach is used to go break down all these barriers.

And I can really describe some of them to you. One of the latest ones up in my neck of the woods is, we had trouble getting prenatal care centers staffed. You know, doctors don't really want to spend time working in these areas, because they are worried about malpractice and all this kind of thing, and they have their own practice.

Well, with the Hennepin County Medical Society, we were able to come up with a way that doctors that are in retirement can basically come in and staff prenatal care centers, which they are very anxious to do and help out, without any fear of being sued. And

we're now helping the legislators try to write legislation that will just generally do that for the whole State of Minnesota.

That's a barrier, you see, to getting a prevention initiative underway. Getting the bureaucracy to provide—these are very simple things. In the teenage mothers school, one of the things the moms said to me was, "You know, a number of us are pregnant. Don't you think we should have fruit in our diet?" So we gave them a basket of fruit every morning. Before long, the Minneapolis school system was giving them a basket of fruit every morning.

What this country needs, I think, aside from preventive, collaborative things, as opposed to individualistic cure kinds of things, what it really, really needs is a whole series of the existing forces to collaborate, get together, okay, and to break down barriers. Because, let me tell you, there's plenty of money to fix these problems. It's there; it just isn't being spent very wisely.

So the business community is interested in Success by Six, because that's what it does—no new agencies—it just goes around and makes use of the community's resources. It gets CEOs involved along with heads of hospitals, et cetera, and we go at it the old-fashioned way, saying, "Why the hell can't we fix this? What are you doing it that way for? Why don't you do it this way?" And if we need an extra \$10,000 or \$15,000 here or there, fine.

That program in Minneapolis, to give you an idea of the cost, the Minneapolis United Way budget is about \$48 million raised in the City of Minneapolis for the United Way. The whole Success by Six effort has never cost more than \$450,000 of that \$48 million, and look at the return we're getting. It's because we're trying to figure out how to stop doing things wrong, you know, and help get together and admit it, and then get on and fix it.

Mrs. UNSOELD. But how do you transport that to other places?

Dr. RENIER. Well, United Way of America has done some of that. There's a tremendous program now going in Jacksonville, Florida. There's a big program going in Nashville, Tennessee, Atlanta. Actually, up in your State, you perhaps know that Jimmy Johnson of Boeing is leading the charge. We get the corporate community to take this on, to try to figure out ways, acting as a catalyst in developing meaningful pilots to demonstrate to the public sector what can be done, if they are just willing to break up this bloody bureaucracy and get after the problem.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Dr. Renier, thank you.

Mr. ROEMER. Dr. Renier, for Valentine's Day, we'll send your wife a transcript of Jolene's very nice remarks.

Dr. RENIER. Thank you.

Let me recognize the distinguished member from Rhode Island, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to focus on what I think is a major issue underlying this whole debate about the Federal role in elementary and secondary education. The criticism today, I think, of Federal programs is that they are categorical, fragmented, process programs. You make the application, you fill out the grants, you follow the accounting rules, you get the money, and the educational process is coincidental, at best.

In response to that, people are suggesting to us that we simply—not simply—but we set standards, we transfer resources, relatively unfettered resources, to the States, and let them go about doing their business. That, I think, begs many questions. Two principal questions: How do you set the standards? I'll defer that for a moment. But I think another question: What happens when schools or school systems don't meet the standards, what do you do?

As practitioners in Pennsylvania and Indiana, as analysts, and as concerned citizens, I think that's a tough question. That's the heart of everything we're going to be doing, if we try to move to this model. So what do you do now, and what do you propose we do when systems don't meet standards?

Secretary CARROLL. Let me try the future. What we're proposing in Pennsylvania is something called an Academic Recovery Act. Through a number of ways, a school may be declared—and it could even be a program within a school—in need of serious help because it is a failing program. One way to get attention is for a petition of 25 percent of parents to call us in to take a look at what goes on. But there are test scores; there are other things. Another way might be our own initiation as we go around and visit schools.

The point is that, at the time they are declared academically distressed, they then come under a series of mandates sort of—they are mandates, by law—to deal with improving programs, agreements with boards, and what have you.

There comes a point, conceivably—I would hope it would never come—but it could come where we have to throw up our hands and say, "The kids are being cheated. This stuff isn't working." And the Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania dissolves the school and reassigns the kids, either to schools within the district or to neighboring schools.

Now, that's tough, and that's very hard to sell in what we call a local control State where many people prefer not to ever hear from us. But it's something that's going to have to happen. A miniature version of that could happen if we wanted to get really tough about it, in terms of Federal programs.

By the way, we're going to lump Federal programs in on all of this. We're going to find that maybe one of the reasons that we dissolve, at least temporarily—we're not firing teachers or anything; we're just moving the kids out till we can get a grip on what we're doing. And one of the reasons might be the failure of a combination of Federal programs.

It's time to get tough on this. You lose credibility. I mean, you get your detractors, and you all know what that is like. Pick up one for one bill; pick up another for another. Pretty soon, the world is against you. And then you retire gracefully and say you've done a nice thing. That's kind of the view I think we're going to have to adopt as we try to bring about these changes.

Dr. FUHRMAN. I think Pennsylvania is not unusual. There are many States dealing with this issue. I like the emphasis on assistance first before the sanctions come in, because very often it's not a question of well, but it's a question of capacity at the school level.

But I think, from the Federal Government's point of view, it would be worthwhile to ensure that States do have mechanisms like Pennsylvania's in place and that they are meaningful mecha-



nisms. I think it would be too remote for the Federal Government to engage in those kinds of things themselves, but States are in a position to do it. More and more are doing it. And I think you have a right to be satisfied that, as States get money under these programs, that they have mechanisms to deal with failure.

Mr. REED. So you would suggest that we certainly should consider, as part of this reauthorization, that a State could adopt not one, but whatever mechanism they feel is appropriate for doing exactly what Pennsylvania appears to be proposing, which is holding school systems' feet to the fire.

Let me ask another. This is an unrelated question, sort of going from the macrocosm to the microcosm. Again, in the experience of Pennsylvania, or Indiana, or just around the country, to the extent that there are experienced teachers going into classrooms and evaluating, in a constructive way, other teachers, is that something that has disappeared over the last several years?

I'm told that years ago that was a more routine experience, and today that's less routine. As a result—and maybe this is just sort of mythology or totally anecdotal—but that there are young teachers and not so young teachers who are sort of left alone in classrooms with difficult problems, much more difficult than years ago, and without the kind of ongoing feedback, criticism.

Perhaps what I'm applying is my earlier experience as a soldier where, at the worst possible times, your commander would show up to evaluate what you were doing or to inspect the mess hall. One of my senses, and this might go back to those low cost things that we can do right now with the resources we have, is getting back with some type of program where teachers are evaluating other teachers, not in a destructive—your pay is on the line—but in a critical, positive way.

I just wonder what your comments might be.

Mr. ERNST. Congressman, amazingly enough, this is an area of my academic research and interest in teacher education. It's also problematic, because I think there are a lot of my colleagues and friends in the unions who might worry about this with us a little bit.

Having said that, I think part of the answer has to do with thinking differently about how people work in schools. And maybe it's not so much a formative evaluation as it is people working collaboratively in ways that they never have before, so the evaluation isn't so much, "You know, Ernst, you're doing that terribly wrong," but, "Hey, Don, is there a different way that you might think about doing this so that we might work together to do better?"

I also think that it's related to—with all due respect to my colleagues in higher education—it's about those folks thinking differently about how they work with folks at the school level, so that there is a simultaneous renewal, if you will, of the places that prepare teachers and in school sites, so that there's a much more, again, collaborative arrangement rather than noblesse oblige arrangement.

You have some good folks in your State who might be able to help you on that, by the way, like Ted Sizer and others.

So I think it's an interesting question, but I think it's also one that needs to be talked about pretty closely with teachers and with those folks in the school. But I think it's also thinking differently about what kind of evaluation we're talking about, people working together for the betterment rather than for some, you know, job kinds of decisions and those kinds of things.

Mr. REED. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Reed.

I would just like to say to the very distinguished panel, thank you so much for your preparation for today's hearing, for your good, insightful answers to our questions, and for your patience, as well, too, as members left to go vote. You have given us a great deal to think about as we reauthorize the pending legislation before us. We can only say that we hope to keep in touch with you as this process wends its way through the legislative process.

With that said, the record will remain open for 2 weeks for any additional submissions. The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]





BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05982 236 9



ISBN 0-16-041037-1



9 780160 410376

90000